Tuesday,
7th August, 1956

LOK SABHA DEBATES

VOLUME V, 1956

(16th July to 10th August 1956

सत्यमेव जयते

Preservation Unit
28-6-89
Fumigated
On 29.9.83
Parliament Library

THIRTEENTH SESSION, 1956

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

CONTENTS

(Vol. V, Nos. 1—20—16th July to 10th August, 1956).

o. 1. *Monday, 16th July, 1956.* COLUMNS

Member Sworn...... 1
Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 1, 3 to 8, 10 to 12, 14 to 21, 23 to 25, 27, 29 to 31 . 1—29
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 2, 9, 13, 22, 28, 32 to 34. . . . . . . 30—33
Unstarred Questions Nos. 1 to 22, 24, 25 . . . . 33—44
Daily Digest . . . . 45—46

No. 2. *Tuesday, 17th July, 1956.*

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 35, 39, 41, 42, 44 to 50, 52 to 57, 60 and 61 . . 47—75
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 36 to 38, 40, 43, 51, 58, 59, 62 to 67 . . . 75—80
Unstarred Questions Nos. 26 to 59 . . . . 80—96
Daily Digest . . . . 97—100

No. 3. *Wednesday, 18th July* 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 68, 69, 71 to 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 90 to 93, 96 to 99 . . . . 101—29
Written Answers to Questions —
Starred Questions Nos. 70, 75, 77, 79, 81, 84, 87, 89, 94, 95, 100 to 113, 115 to 128 . . . . 129—44
Unstarred Questions Nos. 60 to 81, 83 . . . . 144—52
Correction of Answer to Starred Question— 152—54
Daily Digest . . . . 155—58

No. 4. *Friday, 20th July*, 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 129 to 132, 134, 136 to 138, 140, 141, 143, 147, 15 153, 156, 157, 135, 139 . . . .
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 133, 144 to 146, 148, 149, 154, 155, 15
Unstarred Questions Nos. 84 to 101 . . . .
Daily Digest

No. 5. *Saturday, 21st July*, 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 159 to 167, 169, 171, 172, 174 to 176, 180 to 186 . 203—31
Short Notice Question No. 1 . . . . 231—35
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 168, 170, 173, 177, 178, 187 to 196 . . . . 235—40
Unstarred Questions Nos. 102 to 130 . . . . 240—56
Daily Digest . . . . 257—60

No. 6. *Tuesday, 24th July,* 1956. COLUMNS

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 197 to 202, 204 to 206, 208, 209 212, 213. 216 to 227, 215, 210 . . . . 261—91

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 203, 207, 211, 214. . . . . . . 291—93

Unstarred Questions Nos. 131 to 139 . . . . 293—98

Daily Digest . . . . 299—300

No. 7. *Wednesday, 25th July,* 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 228 to 242, 244 to 252, 254 and 255 . . . 301—30

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 243, 253, 256 to 286 . . . . 330—42

Unstarred Questions Nos. 140 to 176 . . . . 352—58

Daily Digest . . . . 359—62

No. 8. *Thursday, 26th July,* 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 287 to 292, 294 to 298, 300 to 302, 304 to 311, 314 363—91

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 293, 299, 303, 312, 313, 315 to 339, 341 . . 391—404

Unstarred Questions Nos. 177 to 210 . . . . 404—16

Daily Digest . . . . 417—20

No. 9. *Friday, 27th July,* 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 342, 344, 346 to 348, 354, 374, 349 to 353, 355, 356. 358, 359, 361 and 362 . . . . 421—45

Short Notice Questions Nos. 2 to 4 . . . . 445—57

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 343, 345, 357, 360, 364 to 373, 375 to 382, 384 to 393 . . . . 457—70

Unstarred Questions Nos. 212 to 240 . . . . 470—82

Daily Digest . . . . 483—86

No. 10. *Saturdy, 28th July,* 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 396, 398 to 400, 402 to 406, 408, 411, 412, 415, 417, 418, 420, 421, 423, 426, 429, 431, 432, 435, 436 . . . . . . 487—515

Short Notice Question No. 5 . . . . 515—18

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 394, 395, 397, 401, 407, 409, 410, 413, 414, 416, 419, 424, 425, 428, 430, 433, 434, 437, 438 to 447 . . . . 518—29

Unstarred Questions Nos. 241 to 261 . . . . 529—38

Daily Digest . . . . 539—40

COLUMNS

No. 11. *Monday, 30th July*, 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 451 to 454, 456 to 460, 462, 463, 466, 468, 469, 471 to 477, 479, 480 . . . 541—69
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 448 to 450, 455, 461, 464, 465, 467, 470, 478, 481 to 500 . . . 569—82
Unstarred Questions Nos. 262 to 296 . . . 582—98
Daily Digest . . . 599—602

No. 12. *Tuesday, 31st July*, 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 505 to 509, 511 to 522, 525, 528, 529, 531, 534 to 536 . 603—32
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 501 to 504, 510, 523, 524, 526, 527, 530, 532, 533, 537 to 539, 541 to 557 . . . 632—44
Unstarred Questions Nos. 297 to 336 . . . 644—58
Daily Digest . . . 659—64

No. 13. *Wednesday, 1st August*, 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 560, 561, 563 to 565, 567, 568, 571, 573 to 577, 579, 580 . . . 665—91
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 558, 559, 562, 566, 569, 570, 572, 578, 581 to 598, 600 to 606, 608 and 609 . . . 691—703
Unstarred Questions Nos. 337 to 351 . . . 704—10
Daily Digest . . . 711—12

No. 14. *Thursday, 2nd August*, 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 611, 613 to 617, 619 to 624, 626 to 629, 631 to 634, 637, 638, 640 to 642, 644 . . . 713—40
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 610, 612, 618, 625, 630, 635, 636, 639, 643, 645 to 672 . . . 740—56
Unstarred Questions Nos. 352 to 382 . . . 757—70
Daily Digest . . . 771—74

No. 15. *Friday, 3rd August*, 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 673 to 678, 680, 682 to 684, 686, 687, 690, 691, 693, 695 to 698, 701 to 705 . . . 775—803
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 679, 681, 685, 688, 689, 692, 694, 700, 706 to 721 . . 803—12
Unstarred Questions Nos. 383 to 412 and 414 . . . 812—26
Daily Digest . . . 827—30

No. 16. *Monday, 6th August*, 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 722 to 727, 729 to 733, 735 to 737, 741 to 743, 746, 748 to 750. 831—58
Short Notice Question No. 6 . . . 858—5
Written Answers to Questions—
Starred Questions Nos. 728, 734, 738 to 740, 745, 747, 751 to 755, 757 to 776, 778 to 780, 782, 783. 860—7
Unstarred Questions Nos. 415 to 439, 441 to 443 . . . 874—8
Daily Digest . . . 887—90

No. 17. *Tuesday, 7th August*, 1956. COLUMNS

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 784, 786, 787, 789, 790, 792 to 797, 799 to 803, 805 806, 808 to 810 . . . . 891—917

Short Notice Question No. 7 917

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 785, 788, 791, 798, 804, 807, 811 to 836, 838 to 847 . 918—34

Unstarred Questions Nos. 444 to 486, 488 to 494 . . . . 934—56

Daily Digest . . . . 957—60

No. 18. *Wednesday, 8th August*, 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 848 to 867, 869, 870 . . . . 961—88

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 868, 871 to 893 . . . . . 988—97

Unstarred Questions Nos. 495 to 529 . . . . . 997—1012

Daily Digest . . . . 1013—16

No. 19. *Thursday, 9th August*, 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 894, 896 to 900, 903, 905 to 907, 909, 914, 915, 918, 921 to 923, 925 to 931 . . . . 1017—44

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 895, 901, 902, 904, 908, 910 to 913, 916, 917, 919, 920, 924, 932 to 942 . . . . 1044—52

Unstarred Questions Nos. 530 to 553 . . . . 1052—62

Daily Digest . . . . 1063—64

No. 20. *Friday, 10th August*, 1956.

Oral Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 944 to 947, 949, 950, 953 to 957, 959 to 964, 966, 984, 967, 968 . . . . 1065—93

Short Notice Question No. 8 1093

Written Answers to Questions—

Starred Questions Nos. 943, 948, 951, 952, 958, 965, 969 to 983, 985 to 993 . 1094—1104

Unstarred Questions Nos. 554 to 603 . . . . . . 1104—26

Daily Digest . . . . 1127—30

Index . . . . 1—172

LOK SABHA

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

A

Abdullabhai, Mulla Taherali Mulla (Chanda).

Abdus Sattar, Shri (Kalna-Katwa).

Achal Singh, Seth [Agra Distt. (West)].

Achalu, Shri Sunkam (Nalgonda—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Achint Ram, Lala (Hissar).

Achuthan, Shri K. T. (Crangannur).

Agarawal, Shri Hoti Lal [Jalaun Distt. *cum* Etawah Distt.—(West) *cum* Jhansi Distt.—(North)].

Agrawal, Shri Mukund Lal [Pilibhit Distt. *cum* Bareilly Distt.—(East)].

Ajit Singh, Shri (Kapurthala-Bhatinda—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ajit Singhji, General (Sirohi-Pali).

Akarpuri, Sardar Teja Singh (Gurdaspur).

Alagesan, Shri O. V. (Chingleput).

Altekar, Shri Ganesh Sadashiv (North Satara).

Alva, Shri Joachim (Kanara).

Amin, Dr. Indubhai B. (Baroda West).

Amjad Ali, Shri (Goalpara-Garo Hills).

Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari (Mandi-Mahasu).

Anandchand, Shri (Bilaspur).

Ansari, Dr. Shaukatullah Shah (Bidar).

Anthony, Shri Frank (Nominated—Anglo-Indians).

Asthana, Shri Sita Rama (Azamgarh Distt.—West).

Ayyangar, Shri M. Ananthasayanam (Tirupati).

Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam (Rampur Distt. *cum* Bareilly Distt.—West).

Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha (Purnea *cum* Santhal Parganas).

B

Babunath Singh, Shri (Surguja-Raigarh—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Badam Singh, Chowdhary (Budaun Distt.—West).

Bagdi, Shri Magan Lal (Mahasamund).

Bahadur Singh, Shri (Ferozepore-Ludhiana—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Balakrishnan, Shri S. C. (Erode—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Balasubramaniam, Shri S. (Madurai).

Baldev Singh, Sardar (Nawan Shahr).

Balmiki, Shri Kanhaiya Lal (Bulandshahr Distt.—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Banerjee, Shri Durga Charan (Midnapore-Jhargram).

Bansal, Shri Ghamandi Lal (Jhajjar-Rewari).

Bansilal, Shri (Jaipur).

Barman, Shri Upendranath (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Barrow, Shri A. E. T. (Nominated—Anglo-Indians).

Barupal, Shri Panna Lall (Ganganagar-Jhunjhunu—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Basappa, Shri C. R. (Tumkur).

Basu, Shri A. K. (North Bengal).

Basu, Shri Kamal Kumar (Diamond Harbour),

Bhagat, Shri B. R. (Patna *cum* Shahabad).

Bhakt Darshan, Shri [Garhwal Distt.—(East) *cum* Moradabad Distt.—(North-East)]

Bharati, Shri Goswamiraja Sahdeo (Yeotmal).

Bhargava, Pandit Mukat Behari Lal (Ajmer South).

Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das (Gurgaon).

Bhartiya, Shri Shaligram Ramchandra (We Khandesh).

Bhatkar, Shri Laxman Shravan (Buldana-Akola—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

B—*contd.*

Bhatt, Shri Chandrashanker (Broach).

Bhawani Singh, Shri (Barmer-Jalore).

Bhawanji, Shri (Kutch West).

Bheekha Bhai, Shri (Banswara—Dungarpur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Bhonsle, Shri Jagannathrao Krishna Rao (Ratnagiri North).

Bidari, Shri Ramappa Balappa (Bijapur South).

Birbal Singh, Shri [Jaunpur Distt.—(East)].

Biren Dutt, Shri (Tripura West).

Bogawat, Shri U. R. (Ahmednagar South).

Boovaraghasamy, Shri V. (Perambalur).

Borkar, Shrimati Anusayabai (Bhandara—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Borooah, Shri Dev Kanta (Nowgong).

Bose, Shri P. C. (Manbhum North).

Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri (Gaya East).

Brohmo-Chaudhury, Shri Sitanath (Goalpara-Garo Hills—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Buchhikotaiah, Shri Sanaka (Masulipatnam).

C

Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu (Basirhat).

Chaliha, Shri Bimalaprosad (Sibsagar—North-Lakhimpur).

Chanda, Shri Anil Kumar (Birbhum).

Chandak, Shri B. L. (Betul).

Chandrasekhar, Shrimati M. (Tiruvallur—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Charak, Th. Lakshman Singh (Jammu and Kashmir).

Chatterjea, Shri Tushar (Serampore).

Chatterjee, Dr. Susilranjan (West Dinajpur).

Chatterjee, Shri N. C. (Hooghly).

Chattopadhyaya, Shri Harindranath (Vijayavada).

Chaturvedi, Shri Rohanlal [Etah Distt.—(Central)].

Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal [Shahjahanpur Distt.—(North) *cum* Kheri—(East)—Reserved—Sch. Castes].

Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar (Berhampore).

Chavda, Shri Akbar (Banaskantha).

Chettiar, Shri N. Vr. N. Ar. Nagappa (Ramanathapuram).

Chettiar, Shri T. S. Avinashilingam (Tiruppur).

Chowdary, Shri C. R. (Narasaraopet).

Chowdhury, Shri Nikunja Behari (Ghatal).

D

Dabhi, Shri Fulsinhji B. (Kaira North).

Damar, Shri Amar Singh Sabji (Jhabua—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Damodaran, Shri G. R. (Pollachi).

Damodaran, Shri Nettur P. (Tellicherry).

Das, Dr. Mono Mohon (Burdwan—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Das, Shri B. (Jaipur-Keonjhar).

Das, Shri Basanta Kumar (Contai).

Das, Shri Beli Ram (Barpeta).

Das, Shri Bijoy Chandra (Ganjam South).

Das, Shri Kamal Krishna (Birbhum—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Das, Shri Nayan Tara (Monghyr Sadr *cum* Jamui—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Das, Shri Ram Dhani (Gaya East.—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Das, Shri Ramananda (Barrackpore).

Das, Shri Sarangadhar (Dhenkanal-W Cuttack).

Das, Shri Shree Narayan (Darbhanga Central).

Dasaratha Deb, Shri (Tripura East).

Datar, Shri Balwant Nagesh (Belgaum North).

Deb, Shri Suresh Chandra (Cachar-Lushai Hills).

Deo, H. H. Maharaja Rajendra Narayan Singh (Kalahandi-Bolangir).

Deogam, Shri Kanhu Ram (Chaibasa—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Desai, Shri Kanayalal Nanabhai (Surat).

Desai, Shri Khandubhai Kasanji (Halar).

Deshmukh, Dr. Panjabrao S. (Amravati East).

D—*contd.*

Deshmukh, Shri Chintaman Dwarkanath (Kolaba).

Deshmukh, Shri K. G. (Amravati West).

Deshpande, Shri Govind Hari (Nasik Central).

Deshpande, Shri Vishnu Ghanashyam (Guna).

Dholakia, Shri Gulab Shankar Amritlal (Kutch East).

Dhulekar, Shri R. V. [Jhansi Distt.—(South)].

Dhusiya, Shri Sohan Lal (Basti Distt.—(Central-East) *cum* Gorakhpur Distt.—(West)—Reserved—Sch. Caste].

Digambar Singh, Shri (Etah Distt.—(West *cum* Mainpuri Distt.—(West) *cum* Mathura Distt.—(East)].

Diwan, Shri Raghavendrarao Srinivasrao (Osmanabad).

Dube, Shri Mulchand [Farrukhabad Distt. (North)].

Dube, Shri Udai Shankar [Basti Distt. (North)].

Dubey, Shri Rajaram Giridharlal (Bijapur North).

Dutt, Shri Asim Krishna (Calcutta South-West).

Dutta, Shri Santosh Kumar (Howrah).

Dwivedi, Shri Dashrath Prasad (Gorakhpur Distt.—Central).

Dwivedi, Shri M. L. (Hamirpur Distt.).

E

Eacharan, Shri Iyyunni (Ponnani—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ebenezer, Dr. S. A. (Vikarabad).

Elayaperumal, Shri L. (Cuddalore—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

F

Fotedar, Pandit Sheo Narayan (Jammu and Kashmir).

G

Gadgil, Shri Narhar Vishnu (Poona Central(

Gadilingana Gowd, Shri (Kurnool).

Gami Malludora, Shri (Visakhapatnam—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Gandhi, Shri Feroze [Pratapgarh Distt. (West) *cum* Rae Bareli Distt. (East)].

Gandhi, Shri Maneklal Maganlal (Panch Mahals *cum* Baroda East).

Gandhi, Shri V. B. (Bombay City—North).

Ganga Devi, Shrimati (Lucknow Distt. *cum* Bara Banki Distt.—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ganpati Ram, Shri [Jaunpur Distt. (East)—Reserved—Sch. Castes)].

Garg, Shri Ram Pratap (Patiala).

Gautam, Shri C. D. (Balaghat).

Ghose, Shri Surendra Mohan (Malda).

Ghosh, Shri Atulya (Burdwan).

Ghulam Qader, Shri (Jammu and Kashmir).

Gidwani, Shri Choithram Partabrai (Thana)

Giri, Shri V. V. (Pathapatnam).

Giridhari Bhoi, Shri (Kalahandi-Bolangir) Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Gohain, Shri Chowkhamoon (Nominated—Assam Tribal Areas).

Gopalan, Shri A. K. (Cannanore).

Gopi Ram, Shri (Mandi-Mahasu--Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Gounder, Shri K. Periaswami (Erode).

Gounder, Shri K. [Sakthivadivel (Periyakulam).

Govind Das, Seth (Mandla-Jabalpur South).

Guha, Shri Arun Chandra (Santipur).

Gupta, Shri Badshah (Mainpuri Distt.—East).

Gupta, Shri Sadhan Chandra (Calcutta—South—East).

Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S. (Mysore).

H

Hansda, Shri Benjamin (Purnea *cum* Santal Parganas—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Hari Mohan, Dr. (Manbhum North—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Hasda, Shri Subodh (Midnapore-Jhargram—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

H—*contd.*

Hazarika, Shri Jogendra Nath (Dibrugarh).

Heda, Shri H. C. (Nizamabad).

Hembrom, Shri Lal (Santal Parganas *cum* Hazaribagh—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Hem Raj, Shri (Kangra).

Hukam Singh, Sardar (Kapurthala-Bhatinda).

Hyder Husein, Chaudhri (Gonda Distt.—North).

I

Ibrahim, Shri A. (Ranchi North-East).

Iqbal Singh, Sardar (Fazilka-Sirsa).

Islamuddin, Shri Muhammad (Purnea—North-East).

Iyyunni, Shri C. R. (Trichur).

J

Jagjivan Ram, Shri (Shahabad South—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jain, Shri Ajit Prasad (Saharanpur Distt.—West *cum* Muzaffarnagar Distt.—North).

Jain, Shri Nemi Saran (Bijnor Distt.—South).

Jaipal Singh, Shri (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

aisoorya, Dr. N. M. (Medak).

ajware, Shri Ramraj (Santal Parganas *cum* Hazaribagh).

Jangde, Shri Resham Lal (Bilaspur—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jatav-vir, Dr. Manik Chand (Bharatpur-Sawai Madhopur—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jayaraman, Shri A. (Tindivanam—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jayashri, Shrimati (Bombay-Suburban).

Jena, Shri Kanhu Charan (Balasore—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jena, Shri Lakshmidhar (Jaipur-Keonjhar—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Jena, Shri Niranjan (Dhenkanal-West Cuttack—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

ethan, Shri Kherwar (Palamau *cum* Hazaribagh *cum* Ranchi—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Jhunjhunwala, Shri Banarsi Prasad (Bhagalpur Central).

Jogendra Singh, Sardar (Bahraich Distt.—West).

Joshi, Shri Anand Chandra (Shahdol-Sidhi).

Joshi, Shri Jethalal Harikrishna (Madhya Saurashtra).

Joshi, Shri Krishnacharya (Yadgir).

Joshi, Shri Liladhar (Shajapur-Rajgarh).

Joshi, Shri Moreshwar Dinkar (Ratnagiri South).

Joshi, Shri Nandlal (Indore).

Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra (Karnal).

Jwala Prashad, Shri (Ajmer North).

K

Kachiroyar, Shri N. D. Govindaswami (Cuddalore).

Kajrolkar, Shri Narayan Sadoba (Bombay City—North—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Kakkan, Shri P. (Madurai—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Kale, Shrimati Anasuyabai (Nagpur).

Kamal Singh, Shri (Shahabad—North-West).

Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu (Hoshangabad).

Kamble, Dr. Devrao Nambevrao (Nanded—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Kandasamy, Shri S. K. Babie (Tiruchengode).

Kanungo, Shri Nityanand (Kendrapara).

Karmarkar, Shri D. P. (Dharwar North).

Karni Singhji, His Highness Maharaja Shri Bahadur of Bikaner (Bikaner-Churu).

Kasliwal, Shri Nemi Chandra (Kotah-Jhalawar).

Katham, Shri Birendranath (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Katju, Dr. Kailas Nath (Mandsaur).

Kayal, Shri Paresh Nath (Basirhat—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Kazmi, Shri Syed Mohammad Ahmad (Sultanpur Distt.—North *cum* Faizabad Distt.—South-West).

Kelappan, Shri K. (Ponnani).

Keshavaiengar, Shri N. (Bangalore North).

K—*contd.*

Keskar, Dr. B. V. (Sultanpur Distt.—South).

Khan, Shri Sadath Ali (Ibrahimpatnam).

Khardekar, Shri B. H. (Kolhapur *cum* Satara).

Khare, Dr. N. B. (Gwalior).

Khedkar, Shri Gopalrao Bajirao (Buldana. Akola).

Khongmen, Shrimati B. (Autonomous Distts. —Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Khuda Baksh, Shri Muhammed (Murshidabad).

Kirolikar, Shri Wasudeo Shridhar (Durg).

Kolay, Shri Jagannath (Bankura).

Kottukappally, Shri George Thomas (Meenachil).

Kripalani, Acharya J. B. (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea).

Krishna, Shri M. R. (Karimnagar—Reserved —Sch. Castes).

Krishna Chandra, Shri (Mathura Distt.—West).

Krishnamachari, Shri T. T. (Madras).

Krishnappa, Shri M. V. (Kolar).

Krishnaswami, Dr. A. (Kancheepuram).

Kureel, Shri Baij Nath (Pratapgarh Distt.—West *cum* Rae Bareli Distt.—East—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Kureel, Shri Piare Lal (Banda Distt. *cum* Fatehpur Distt.—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

L

Lakshmayya, Shri Paidi (Anantapur).

Lal Singh, Sardar (Ferozepur-Ludhiana).

Lallanji, Shri (Faizabad Distt.—North-West).

Laskar, Shri Nibaran Chandra (Cachar-Lushai Hills—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Lingam, Shri N. M. (Coimbatore).

Lotan Ram, Shri (Jalaun Distt. *cum* Etawah Distt.—West *cum* Jhansi Distt.—North—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

M

Madiah Gowda, Shri (Bangalore South).

Mahapatra, Shri Sibnarayan Singh (Sundargarh—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Mahata, Shri Bhajahari (Manbhum South *cum* Dhalbhum).

Mahodaya, Shri Vaijanath (Nimar).

Maitra, Shri Mohit Kumar (Calcutta—North West).

Majhi, Shri Chaitan (Manbhum—South *cum* Dhalbhum—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Majhi, Shri Ram Chandra (Mayurbhanj—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Majithia, Sardar Surjit Singh (Taran Taran).

Malaviya, Shri Keshava Deva (Gonda Distt.—East *cum* Basti Distt.— West).

Malliah, Shri U. Srinivasa (South Kanara—North).

Malvia, Shri Bhagu-Nandu (Shajapur-Rajgarh —Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Malviya, Pandit Chatur Narain (Raisen).

Malviya, Shri Motilal (Chhatarpur-Datia-Tikamgarh—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Mandal, Dr. Pashupati (Bankura—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Mascarene, Kumari Annie (Trivandrum).

Masuodi, Maulana Mohammad Saeed (Jammu and Kashmir).

Masuriya Din, Shri (Allahabad Distt.—East *cum* Jaunpur Distt.—West—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Mathew, Shri C. P. (Kottayam).

Mathuram, Dr. Edward Paul (Tiruchirapalli).

Matthen, Shri C. P. (Thiruvellah).

Mavalankar, Shrimati Sushila (Ahmedabad

Maydeo, Shrimati Indira A. (Poona South).

Mehta, Shri Asoka (Bhandara).

Mehta, Shri Balvantray Gopaljee (Gohilwad).

Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha (Udaipur).

Mehta, Shri Jaswantraj (Jodhpur).

Menon, Shri K. A. Damodara (Kozhikode).

Minimata, Shrimati (Bilaspur-Durg-Raipur —Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Mishra, Pandit Suresh Chandra (Monghyr North-East).

Mishra, Shri Bibhuti (Saran *cum* Champaran).

Mishra, Shri Lalit Narayan (Darbhanga *cum* Bhagalpur).

M.—*contd.*

Mishra, Shri Lokenath (Puri).

Mishra, Shri Mathura Prasad (Monghyr—North-West).

Mishra, Shri Shyam Nandan (Darbhanga—North).

Misra, Pandit Lingaraj (Khurda).

Mishra, Shri Bhupendra Nath (Bilaspur-Durg-Raipur).

Misra, Shri Raghubar Dayal (Bulandshahr Distt.).

Misra, Shri Sarju Prasad (Deoria Distt.—South).

Missir, Shri Vijineshwar (Gaya North).

Mohd. Akbar, Sofi (Jammu and Kashmir).

Mohiuddin, Shri Ahmed (Hyderabad City).

Morarka, Shri Radheshyam Ramkumar (Ganganagar-Jhunjhunu).

More, Shri K. L. (Kolhapur *cum* Satara—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

More, Shri Shankar Shantaram (Sholapur).

Muchaki Kosa, Shri (Bastar—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Mudaliar, Shri C. Ramaswamy (Kumbakonam).

Muhammed Shafee, Chaudhuri (Jammu and Kashmir).

Mukerjee, Shri Hirendra Nath (Calcutta—North-East).

Mukne, Shri Y. M. (Thana—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Muniswamy, Shri N. R. (Wandiwash).

Muniswamy, Shri V. (Tindivanam).

Murli Manohar, Shri (Ballia Distt. East).

Murthy, Shri B. S. (Eluru).

Musafir, Giani Gurmukh Singh (Amritsar).

Mushar, Shri Kirai (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Muthukrishnan, Shri M. (Vellore—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

N

Naidu, Shri Nalla Reddi (Rajahmundry).

Nair, Shri C. Krishnan (Outer Delhi).

Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara).

Nambiar, Shri K. Ananda (Mayuram).

Nanadas, Shri Mangalagiri (Ongole—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Nanda, Shri Gulzarilal (Sabarkantha).

Narasimham, Shri S. V. L. (Guntur).

Narasimhan, Shri C. R. (Krishnagiri).

Naskar, Shri Purnendu Sekhar (Diamond Harbour—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Natawadkar, Shri Jayantrao Ganpat (West Khandesh—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Nathani, Shri Hari Ram (Bhilwara).

Nathwani, Shri Narendra P. (Sorath).

Nayar, Shri V. P. (Chirayinkil).

Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal (Allahabad Distt.—East *cum* Jaunpur Distt.—West).

Nehru, Shrimati Shivraj Vati (Lucknow Distt.—Central)

Nehru, Shrimati Uma (Sitapur Distt. *cum* Kheri Distt.—West).

Nesamony, Shri A. (Nagercoil).

Neswi, Shri T. R. (Dharwar—South).

Nevatia, Shri R. P. (Sahjahanpur Distt. —North *cum* Kheri—East).

Nijalingappa, Shri S. (Chitaldrug).

P

Palchoudhury, Shrimati Ila (Nabadwip).

Pande, Shri Badri Dutt (Almora Distt.—North—East).

Pande, Shri C. D. (Naini Tal Distt. *cum* Almora Distt.—South-West *cum* Bareilly Distt.—North).

Pandey, Dr. Natabar (Sambalpur).

Pannalal, Shri (Faizabad Distt.—North-West—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Paragi Lal, Chaudhari (Sitapur Distt. *cum* Kheri Distt.—West—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Paranjpe, Shri R. G. (Bhir).

Parekh, Dr. Jayantilal Narbheram (Zalawad).

Parikh, Shri Shantilal Girdharilal (Mehsana East).

P—*contd.*

Parmar, Shri Rupaji Bhavji (Panch Mahals *cum* Baroda East—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Pataskar, Shri Hari Vinayak (Jalgaon).

Patel, Shri Bahadurbhai Kunthabhai (Surat—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Patel, Shri Rajeshwar (Muzaffarpur *cum* Darbhanga).

Patel, Shrimati Maniben Vallabhbhai (Kaira South).

Pateria, Shri Sushil Kumar (Jabalpur North).

Patil, Shri P. R. Kanavade (Ahmednagar North).

Patil, Shri S. K. (Bombay City—South).

Patil, Shri Shankargauda Veeranagauda (Belgaum South).

Patnaik, Shri Uma Charan (Ghumsur).

Pawar, Shri Vyankatrao Pirajirao (South Satara).

Pillai, Shri P. T. Thanu (Tirunelveli).

Pocker Saheb, Shri B. (Malappuram).

Prabhakar, Shri Naval (Outer Delhi—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Punnoose, Shri P. T. (Alleppey).

R

Rachiah, Shri N. (Mysore—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Radha Raman, Shri (Delhi City).

Raghavachari, Shri K. S. (Penukonda).

Raghavaiah, Shri Pisupati Vekata (Ongole).

Raghubir Sahai, Shri (Etah Distt.—North-East *cum* Budaun Distt—East).

Raghubir Singh, Choudhary (Agra Distt.—East).

Raghunath Singh, Shri (Banaras Distt.—Central).

Raghuramaiah, Shri Kotha (Tenali).

Rahman, Shri M. Hifzur (Moradabad Distt.—Central).

Raj Bahadur, Shri (Jaipur-Sawai Madhopur).

Rajabhoj, Shri P. N. (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ramachander, Dr. D. (Vellore).

Ramanand Shastri, Swami (Unnao Distt. *cum* Rae Bareli Distt.—West *cum* Hardoi Distt.—South-East—Reserved—Sch. Castes)

Ramananda Tirtha, Swami (Gulberga).

Ramasanu, Shri M. D. (Arruppukkottai).

Ramaseshaiah, Shri N. (Parvathipuram).

Ramaswamy, Shri P. (Mahbubnagar—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ramaswamy, Shri S. V. (Salem).

Ram Dass, Shri (Hoshiarpur—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ram Krishan, Shri (Mohindergarh).

Ramnarayan Singh, Babu (Hazaribagh West).

Ram Saran, Shri (Moradabad Distt.—West).

Ram Shankar Lal, Shri (Basti Distt.—Central-East *cum* Gorakhpur Distt.—West).

Ram Subhag Singh, Dr. (Shahabad South)

Ranbir Singh, Ch. (Rohtak).

Randaman Singh, Shri (Shahdol-Sidhi—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Rane, Shri Shivram Rango (Bhusaval).

Ranjit Singh, Shri (Sangrur).

Rao, Dr. Ch. V. Rama (Kakinada).

Rao, Shri B. Rajagopala (Srikakulam).

Rao, Shri B. Shiva (South Kanara—South)

Rao, Shri Kadyala Gopala (Gudivada).

Rao, Shri Konety Mohana (Rajahmundry—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Rao, Shri Kondru Subba (Eluru—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Rao, Shri P. Subba (Nowrangpur).

Rao, Shri Pendyal Raghava (Warangal).

Rao, Shri Rayasam Seshagiri (Nandyal).

Rao, Shri T. B. Vittal (Khammam).

Raut, Shri Bhola (Saran *cum* Champaran—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Ray, Shri Birakisor (Cuttack).

Razmi, Shri Said Ullah Khan (Sehore).

R—*contd.*

Reddi, Shri B. Ramachandra (Nellore).

Reddi, Shri C. Madhao (Adilabad).

Reddi, Shri Y. Eswara (Cuddapah).

Reddy, Shri Baddam Yella (Karimnagar).

Reddy, Shri K. Janardhan (Mahbubnagar).

Reddy, Shri Ravi Narayan (Nalgonda).

Reddy, Shri T. N. Vishwanatha (Chittoor).

Richardson, Bishop John (Nominated—Andaman and Nicobar Islands).

Rishang Keishing, Shri (Outer Manipur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Roy, Dr. Satyaban (Uluberia).

Roy, Shri Bishwa Nath (Deoria Distt.—West).

Rup Narain, Shri (Mirzapur Distt. *cum* Banaras Distt.—West—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

S

Sahaya, Shri Syamnandan (Muzaffarpur Central).

Sahu, Shri Bhagabat (Balasore).

Sahu, Shri Rameshwar (Muzaffarpur *cum* Darbhanga—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Saigal, Sardar Amar Singh (Bilaspur).

Saksena, Shri Mohanlal (Lucknow Distt. *cum* Bara Banki Distt.).

Samanta, Shri Satis Chandra (Tamluk).

Sanganna, Shri T. (Rayagada-Phulbani—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Sankarapandian, Shri M. (Sankaranayinarkovil).

Sarma, Shri Debendra Nath (Gauhati).

Sarmah, Shri Debeswar (Golaghat-Jorhat).

Satish Chandra, Shri (Bareilly Distt. South).

Satyawadi, Dr. Virendra Kumar (Karnal—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Sen, Shri Phani Gopal (Purnea Central).

Sen, Shri Raj Chandra (Kotah-Bundi).

Sen, Shrimati Sushama (Bhagalpur South).

Sewal, Shri A. R. (Chamba-Sirmur).

Shah, Her Highness Rajmata Kamlendu Mati (Garhwal Distt.—West *cum* Tehri Garhwal Distt. *cum* Bijnor Distt.—North.)

Shah, Shri Chimanlal Chakubhai (Gohilwad-Sorath).

Shah, Shri Raichand Bhai N. (Chhindwara).

Shahnawaz Khan, Shri (Meerut Distt.—North-East).

Shakuntala Nayar, Shrimati (Gonda Distt.—West).

Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna (Kanpur Distt.—South *cum* Etawah Distt.—East).

Sharma, Pandit Krishna Chandra (Meerut Distt.—South).

Sharma, Shri Diwan Chand (Hoshiarpur).

Sharma, Shri Khushi Ram (Meerut Distt.—West).

Sharma, Shri Nand Lal (Sikar).

Sharma, Shri Radha Charan (Morena-Bhind).

Shastri, Shri Algu Rai (Azamgarh Distt.—East *cum* Ballia Distt.—West).

Shastri, Shri Raja Ram (Kanpur Distt—Central).

Shivananjappa, Shri M. K. (Mandya).

Shobha Ram, Shri (Alwar).

Shriman Narayan, Shri (Wardha).

Shukla, Pandit Bhagwaticharan (Durg-Bastar).

Siddananjappa, Shri H. (Hassan Chikmagalur).

Singh, Shri C. Sharan (Surguja-Raigarh).

Singh, Shri Digvijaya Narain (Muzaffarpur—North-East).

Singh, Shri Dinesh Pratap (Bahraich Distt.—East).

Singh, Shri Girraj Saran (Bharatpur-Sawai Madhopur).

Singh, Shri Har Prasad (Ghazipur Distt.—West).

Singh, Shri L. Jogeswar (Inner Manipur).

Singh, Shri Mahendra Nath (Saran Central).

Singh, Shri Ram Nagina (Ghazipur Distt.—East *cum* Ballia Distt.—South-West).

S—*contd.*

Singh, Shri Tribhuan Narayan (Banaras Distt.—East).

Singhal, Shri Shri Chand (Aligarh Distt.).

Sinha, Dr. Satyanarain (Saran East).

Sinha, Shri Anirudha (Darbhanga East).

Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad (Muzaffarpur East).

Sinha, Shri Banarsi Prasad (Monghyr Sadr *cum* Jamui).

Sinha, Shri Gajendra Prasad (Palamau *cum* Hazaribagh *cum* Ranchi).

Sinha, Shri Jhulan (Saran North).

Sinha, Shri Kailash Pati (Patna Central).

Sinha, Shri Nageshwar Prasad (Hazaribagh East).

Sinha, Shri S. (Pataliputra).

Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan (Samastipur East).

Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan (Gaya West).

Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari (Patna East)

Sinha, Thakur Jugal Kishore (Muzaffarpur—North-West).

Sinhasan Singh, Shri (Gorakhpur Distt.—South).

Siva, Dr. M. V. Gangadhara (Chittoor—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Snatak, Shri Nardeo (Aligarh Distt.—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Sodhia, Shri Khub Chand (Sagar).

Somana, Shri N. (Coorg).

Somani, Shri G. D. (Nagaur-Pali).

Subrahamanyam, Shri Kandala (Vizianagaram).

Subrahmanyam, Shri Tekur (Bellary).

Subramania Chettiar, Shri (Dharmapuri).

Sundaram, Dr. Lanka (Visakhapatnam).

Sunder Lall, Shri (Saharanpur Distt.—West *cum* Muzaffarnagar Distt.—North—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Suresh Chandra, Dr. (Aurangabad).

Suriya Prashad, Shri (Morena-Bhind—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Swami, Shri Sivamurthi (Kushtagi).

Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu (Dindigul).

Syed Mahmud, Dr. (Champaran East).

T

Tandon, Shri Purushottamdas [Allahabad Distt. (West)].

Tek Chand, Shri (Ambala-Simla).

Telkikar, Shri Shankar Rao (Nanded).

Tewari, Sardar Raj Bhanu Singh (Rewa).

Thimmaiah, Shri Dodda (Kolar—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Thirani, Shri G. D. (Bargarh).

Thomas, Shri A. M. (Ernakulam).

Thomas, Shri A. V. (Srivaikuntam).

Tivary, Shri Venkatesh Narayan (Kanpur Distt.—North *cum* Farrukhabad Distt.—South).

Tiwari, Pandit B. L. (Nimar).

Tiwari, Shri Ram Sahai (Chhatarpur-Datia-Tikamgarh).

Tiwary, Pandit Dwarka Nath (Saran South).

Tripathi, Shri Hira Vallabh (Muzaffarnagar Distt.—South).

Tripathi, Shri Kamakhya Prasad (Darrang).

Tripathi, Shri Vishwambhar Dayal (Unnao Distt. *cum* Rae Bareli Distt.—West *cum* Hardoi Distt.—South-East).

Trivedi, Shri Umashanker Mulji bha (Chittor).

Tulsidas Kilachand, Shri (Mehsana West).

Tyagi, Shri Mahavir (Dehra Dun Distt. *cum* Bijnor Distt.—North-West *cum* Saharanpur Distt.—West).

U

Uikey, Shri M. G. (Mandla-Jabalpur—South—Reserved—Sch. Tribes).

Upadhyay, Pandit Munishwar Dutt (Partapgarh Distt.—East).

Upadhyay, Shri Shiva Dayal (Banda Distt *cum* Fatehpur Distt.).

Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Datt (Satna).

V

Vaishnav, Shri Hanamantrao Ganeshrao (Ambad).

Vaishya, Shri Muldas Bhuderdas (Ahmedabad—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Vallatharas, Shri K. M. (Pudukkottai).

Varma, Shri B. B. (Champaran North).

Varma, Shri Manik Lal (Tonk).

Veeraswamy, Shri V. (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Velayudhan, Shri R. (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Venkataraman, Shri R. (Tanjore).

Verma, Shri Bulaqi Ram (Hardoi Distt.—North-West *cum* Farrukhabad Distt.—East *cum* Shahjahanpur Distt.—South—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Verma, Shri Ramji (Deoria Distt.—East).

Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath (Jullundur).

Vishwanath Prasad, Shri (Azamgarh Distt.—West—Reserved—Sch. Castes).

Vyas, Shri Radhelal (Ujjain).

W

Waghmare, Shri Narayan Rao (Parbhani).

Wilson, Shri J. N. (Mirzapur Distt. *cum* Banaras Distt.—West).

Wodeyar, Shri K. G. (Shimoga).

Z

Zaidi, Col. B. H. (Hardoi Distt.—North-West *cum* Farrukhabad Distt.—East *cum* Shahjahanpur Distt.—South).

LOK SABHA

The Speaker

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar.

The Deputy-Speaker

Sardar Hukam Singh.

Panel of Chairmen

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.
Shri K. S. Raghavachari.
Shri Upendranath Barman.
Shri Frank Anthony.
Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.
Shrimati Sushama Sen.

Secretary

Shri M. N. Kaul, Barrister-at-Law.

Business Advisory Committee

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar. (*Chairman*)
Sardar Hukam Singh.
Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.
Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.
Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.
Shri A. M. Thomas.
Shri Narhar Vishnu Gadgil.
Shri Nageshwar Prasad Sinha.
Shri Dev Kanta Borooah.
Shri M. L. Dwivedi.
Shri Raghubir Sahai.
Shri Asoka Mehta.
Shri B. Ramachandra Reddi.
Shri Uma Charan Patnaik.
Shri Jaipal Singh.

Committee of Privileges

Sardar Hukam Singh. (*Chairman*)
Shri Hari Vinayak Pataskar.
Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.
Pandit Munishwar Dutt Upadhyay.
Shri Dev Kanta Borooah.
Shri R. Venkataraman.
Shri Tekur Subrahmanyam.
Shri Nemi Chandra Kasliwal.
Shri A. K. Gopalan.
Shri J. B. Kripalani.
Shri S. S. More.
Shri Frank Anthony.
Shri Nemi Saran Jain.
Shri Ram Sahai Tiwari.
Shri Lakshman Singh Charak.

Committee on Absence of Members from the sittings of the House

Shri Ganesh Sadashiv Altekar. (*Chairman*)
Shri Ganeshi Lal Chaudhary.
Shri Ram Shankar Lal.
Shri B. L. Chandak.
Shri Paidi Lakshmayya.
Shri Mahendra Nath Singh.
Shri Shivram Rango Rane.
Shri Fulsinhji B. Dabhi.
Shri Bhagwat Jha 'Azad'.
Shri Ram Dass.
Shri U. M. Trivedi.
Shrimati Kamlendu Mati Shah.
Shri C. R. Chowdary.
Shri K. M. Vallatharas.
Shri Vijneshwar Missir.

Committee on Assurances

Shri K. S. Raghavachari. (*Chairman*)
Shri Jaswantraj Mehta.
Shri T. B. Vittal Rao.
Shri K. A. Damodara Menon.
Shri A. E. T. Barrow.
Shri Anirudha Sinha.
Shri Radha Charan Sharma.
Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.
Pandit Krishna Chandra Sharma.
Shri C. P. Matthen.
Sardar Iqbal Singh.
Shri Basant Kumar Das.
Shri Bhupendra Nath Misra.
Shri R. Venkataraman.
Pandit Lingaraj Misra.

Committee on Offices of Profit

Lok Sabha

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. (*Chairman*)
Shri V. B. Gandhi.
Shri S. V. Ramaswamy.
Shri K. Raghuramaiah.
Shri Vishambhar Dayal Tripathi.
Shri R. V. Dhulekar.
Shri Anirudha Sinha.
Shri S. S. More.
Shri Kamal Kumar Basu.
Shri N. Ramaseshaiah.

Rajya Sabha

Shri M. Govinda Reddy.
Kazi Karimuddin.
Shri Amolakh Chand.
Prof. G. Ranga.
Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.

Committee on Petitions

Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah. (*Chairman*)
Shri Shiva Datt Upadhyaya.
Shri K. T. Achuthan.
Shri Sohan Lal Dhusiya.
Shri S. C. Deb.
Shri Liladhar Joshi.
Shri U. R. Bogawat.
Shri Jethalal Harikrishna Joshi.
Shri Ramraj Jajware.
Shri Resham Lal Jangde.
Shri P. N. Rajabhoj.
Shri P. Subba Rao.
Shri Anandchand.
Dr. Ch. V. Rama Rao.
Shri Ramji Verma.

Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions

Sardar Hukam Singh. (*Chairman*)
Shri Raghunath Singh.
Shri Nageshwar Prasad Sinha.
Shri Ganesh Sadashiv Altekar.
Shri Goswamiraja Sahdeo Bharati.
Shri Narendra P. Nathwani.
Shri Radheshyam Ramkumar Morarka.
Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri.
Shri N. Rachiab.
Dr. Natabar Pandey.
Shri Bhawani Singh.
Shri T. B. Vittal Rao.
Shri C. Madhao Reddi.
Shri N. Sreekantan Nair.
Shri Rayasam Seshagiri Rao.

Committee on Subordinate Legislation

Shri N. C. Chatterjee. (*Chairman*)
Shri S. V. Ramaswamy.
Shri N. M. Lingam.
Shri A. Ibrahim.
Shri Hanamantrao Ganeshrao Vaishnav.
Shri Tek Chand.
Shri Ganpati Ram.
Shri Nandlal Joshi.
Shri Diwan Chand Sharma.
Shri Hem Raj.
Shri H. Siddananjappa.
Dr. A Krishnaswami.
Shri Tulsidas Kilachand.
Shri Hirendra Nath Mukerjee.
Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.

Estimates Committee

Shri Balvantray Gopaljee Mehta. (*Chairman*)
Shri B. S. Murthy.
Shrimati B. Khongmen.
Shri Nageshwar Prasad Sinha.
Shri B. L. Chandak.
Shri Amarnath Vidyalankar.
Shri Venkatesh Narayan Tivary.
Shri Satis Chandra Samanta.
Shri Raghavendrarao Srinivasrao Diwan.
Shri M. R. Krishna.
Shri Jethalal Harikrishna Joshi.
Shri Bhawani Singh.
Shri P. Subba Rao.
Shri P. N. Rajabhoj.
Shri Vishnu Ghanashyam Deshpande.
Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha.
Pandit Dwarka Nath Tiwary.
Shri C. R. Narasimhan.
Shri Raghubir Sahai.
Pandit Algu Rai Shastri.
Shri Abdus Sattar.
Shri Lakshman Singh Charak.
Shri N. Rachiah.
Shri Radheshyam Ramkumar Morarka.
Shri Mangalagiri Nanadas.
Shri T. B. Vittal Rao.
Shri Y. Gadilingana Gowd.
Shri Jaswantraj Mehta.
Shri A. E. T. Barrow.
Shri Choithram Partabrai Gidwani.

General Purposes Committee

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar (*Chairman*)
Sardar Hukam Singh.
Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.
Shri Upendra Nath Barman.
Shri Frank Anthony.
Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.
Shrimati Sushama Sen.
Shri K. S. Raghavachari.
Shri B. G. Mehta.
Shri V. B. Gandhi.
Shri Satya Naryan Sinha.
Shri N. C. Chatterjee.
Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah.
Shri G. S. Altekar.
Shri U. S. Malliah.
Shri A. K. Gopalan.
Shri Tulsidas Kilachand.
Shri J. B. Kripalani.

Shri Uma Charan Patnaik.
Dr. A. Krishnaswami.

House Committee

Shri U. Srinivasa Malliah (*Chairman*)
Shri Birbal Singh.
Shri Radha Charan Sharma.
Shri George Thomas Kottukapally.
Shri Digvijaya Narain Singh.
Shri Krishnacharya Joshi.
Shri N. Somana.
Shri Bhupendra Nath Misra.
Shri N. D. Govindaswami Kachiroyar.
Shri Raj Chandra Sen.
Shri K. Ananda Nambiar.
Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.

Joint Committee on Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament

Lok Sabha

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha. (*Chairman*)
Shri Bhagwat Jha 'Azad'.
Shri U. Srinivasa Malliah.
Shri Diwan Chand Sharma.
Shri Jagan Nath Koley.
Shri G. H. Deshpande.
Shri Nemi Chandra Kasliwal.
Shri N. C. Chatterjee.
Shri P. T. Punnoose.
Shri Asoka Mehta.

Rajya Sabha

Shri H. C. Dasappa.
Shri D. Narayana.
Shri R. P. N. Sinha.
Shrimati Chandravati Lakhanpal.
Shri V. K. Dhage.

Library Committee

Lok Sabha

Sardar Hukam Singh. (*Chairman*)
Shri V. N. Tivary.
Shri M. L. Dwivedi.
Shri U. C. Patnaik.
Shri M. D. Joshi.
Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

Rajya Sabha

Shri R. D. 'Dinkar' Sinha.
Shri Theodre Bodra.
Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.

Public Accounts Committee

Lok Sabha

Shri V. B. Gandhi. (*Chairman*)
Shri K. G. Deshmukh.
Shri U. Srinivasa Malliah.
Shri Diwan Chand Sharma.
Shri C. D. Pande.
Shri Kamal Kumar Basu.
Shri V. Booveraghasamy.
Dr. Indubhai B. Amin.
Shri Nibaran Chandra Laskar.
Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha.
Shri Tribhuan Narayan Singh.
Shri Radhelal Vyas.
Shri C. P. Matthen.
Shri J. B. Kripalani.
Shrimati Shakuntala Nayar.

Rajya Sabha

Shri G. Ranga.
Shri R. M. Deshmukh.
Shrimati Pushpalata Das.
Shri Shyam Dhar Misra.
Shri P. T. Leuva.
Shri B. C. Ghose.
Shri J. V. K. Vallabharao.

Rules Committee

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar. (*Chairman*)
Sardar Hukam Singh.
Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.
Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.
Shri N. Keshavaiengar.
Shri Shivram Rango Rane.
Shri Ghamandi Lal Bansal.
Shri Khushi Ram Sharma.
Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah.
Shri Satis Chandra Samanta.
Dr. N. M. Jaisoorya.
Shri N. C. Chatterjee.
Shri Bhawani Singh.
Shri Kamal Kumar Basu.
Shri K. S. Raghavachari.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Members of the Cabinet

Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and also in charge of the Department of Atomic Energy—Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.

Minister of Education and National Resources and Scientific Research—Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

Minister of Home Affairs—Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.

Minister of Communications—Shri Jagjivan Ram.

Minister of Health—Rajkumari Amrit Kaur.

Minister of Finance—Shri C. D. Deshmukh.

Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power—Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.

Minister of Defence—Dr. Kailas Nath Katju.

Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel—Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.

Minister of Law and Minority Affairs—Shri C. C. Biswas.

Minister of Railways and Transport—Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

Minister of Works, Housing and Supply—Sardar Swaran Singh.

Minister of Production—Shri K. C. Reddy.

Minister of Food and Agriculture—Shri Ajit Prasad Jain.

Minister of Labour—Shri Khandubhai Desai.

Minister without Portfolio—Shri V. K. Krishna Menon.

Ministers of Cabinet Rank (but not members of the Cabinet)

Minister of Parliamentary Affairs—Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.

Minister of Defence Organisation—Shri Mahavir Tyagi.

Minister of Information and Broadcasting—Dr. B. V. Keskar.

Minister of Trade—Shri D. P. Karmarkar.

Minister of Agriculture—Dr. Panjabrao S. Deshmukh.

Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs—Dr. Syed Mahmud.

Minister of Legal Affairs—Shri Hari Vinayak Pataskar.

Minister of Natural Resources—Shri K. D. Malaviya.

Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure—Shri M. C. Shah.

Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure—Shri Arun Chandra Guha.

Minister of Rehabilitation—Shri Mehr Chand Khanna.

Minister of Consumer Industries—Shri Nityanand Kanungo.

Minister in the Ministry of Communications—Shri Raj Bahadur.

Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs—Shri B. N. Datar.

Minister of Heavy Industries—Shri M. M. Shah.

Deputy Ministers

Deputy Minister of Defence—Sardar S. S. Majithia.

Deputy Minister of Labour—Shri Abid Ali.

Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation—Shri J. K. Bhonsle.

Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport—Shri O. V. Alagesan.

Deputy Minister of Health—Shrimati M. Chandrasekhar.

Deputy Minister of External Affairs—Shri Anil Kumar Chanda.

Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture—Shri M. V. Krishnappa

Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power—Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi.

Deputy Minister of Production—Shri Satish Chandra.

Deputy Minister of Planning—Shri Shyam Nandan Mishra.

Deputy Minister of Education—Dr. K. L. Shrimali.

Deputy Minister of Finance—Shri Bali Ram Bhagat.

Deputy Minister of Education—Dr. Mono Mohon Das.

Parliamentary Secretaries]

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs—Shrimati Lakshmi N. Menon.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport—Shri Shahnawaz Khan.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs—Shri Jogendra Nath Hazarika.]

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Production—Shri Rajaram Giridharlal Dubey.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs—Shri Sadath Ali Khan.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Information and Broadcasting—Shri G. Rajagopalan.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Works, Housing and Supply—Shri Purnendu Sekhar Nasker.

CONTENTS

[Part II Debates dated 6th to 25th August, 1956]

No. 16—Monday, 6th August, 1956.

COLUMNS

- *Re.* Statement on Suez Canal Issue . 2219—21
- Motion for Adjournment—
  - Flood in Tripura . 2221—27
- Papers laid on the Table . 2227-28
- Message from Rajya Sabha . 2228-29
- Supreme Court (Number of Judges) Bill . 2229
- States Reorganisation Bill as reported by Joint Committee—
  - Clauses 2 to 15 . 2230—36
  - Clauses 16 to 49 and Schedules I to III . 2237—94
  - Clauses 50 to 70 . 2294—2333
  - Clauses 71 to 114 and Schedules IV to VI . 2334—70
- Daily Digest . 2371—74

No. 17—Tuesday, 7th August, 1956.

- Estimates Committee—
  - Minutes (1955-56), Vol. 5, Nos. 4 and 5 . 2375
- Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill . 2375-76
- National Highways Bill . 2376
- States Reorganisation Bill, as reported by Joint Committee . 2376—2530
  - Clauses 2 to 15 . 2376—2439
  - Clauses 71 to 114 and Schedules IV to VI . 2439—46
  - Clauses 115 to 131 . 2446—2530
- Daily Digest . 2531-32

No. 18—Wednesday, 8th August, 1956.

- Death of Dr. H. C. Mookjerjee . 2532—36
- Statement *re.* Suez Canal Issue . 2536—44
- Daily Digest . 2545-46

No. 19—Thursday, 9th August, 1956.

- Papers laid on the Table . 2547
- Message from Rayja Sabha . 2550
- Business of the House . 2550
- *Re.* Motions for Adjournment . 2550—53
- States Reorganisation Bill, as reported by Joint Committee . 2553—2719
  - Clauses 2 to 131, Schedules I to VI and Clause 1 . 2553—2718
  - Motion to pass, as amended . 2718-19
- River Boards Bill, as passed by Rajya Sabha—
  - Motion to consider . 2719—56
- Daily Digest . 2757—60

No. 20—Friday, 10th August, 1956.

- Motion for Adjournment—
  - Situation in Ahmedabad . 2761—64
- Business Advisory Committee—
  - Thirty-ninth Report . 2764

Columns

No. 20—Friday, 10th August, 1956—Contd.

Estimates Committee—
Minutes (1955-56) Vol. 5, No. 6 2765
Calling attention to matter of urgent public importance—
Compensation by Pakistan in connection with Nekowal incident . 2765—61
River Boards Bill—
Motion to consider as passed by Rajya Sabha . . . . 2768—78
States Reorganisation Bill as reported by Joint Committee—
Motion to pass as amended . . . . 2778—284
Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill (*Omission of section 87B*) . . 2849
Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill (*Amendment of section 497*)—
Motion to consider . . . . 2849—82
Unemployment Relief Bill—
Motion to circulate . . . . 2882—
Women's and Children's Institutions Licensing Bill—
Motion to consider . . . . 2912—
Half-an-hour discussion *re*: Excise Duty on Motor Spirit . 2913—
Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill . 2928—3
Daily Digest . . . . 2931—3

No. 21—Saturday, 11th August, 1956.

Message from Rajya Sabha 2933
Business of the House . . . . . . 2933—35
River Boards Bill, as passed by Rajya Sabha—
Clauses 2 to 29 and 1 . . . . 2936—72
Motion to pass . . . . 2972—76
Inter-State Water Disputes Bill, as passed by Rajya Sabha—
Motion to consider . . . 2976—85, 2987—301
Clauses 2 to 13 and 1 . . . . 3017—19
Motion to pass 3020
Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill—
Report of Joint Committee . . . . 2985—87
Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill—
Motion to refer to Joint Committee . 3020—80
Daily Digest . . . . 3081—82

No. 22—Monday, 13th August, 1956.

Motion for Adjournment—
Drought in East U. P. and Bihar . . . . 3083—84
Papers laid on the Table . . . . 3084—86
Message from Rajya Sabha 3086
Petition *re* : Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill . 3086
Committee on Subordinate Legislation—
Fifth Report . . . . . 3086—87
Re: Expunction from Debates . . . 3087—89
Business Advisory Committee—
Thirty-ninth Report 3089
Standards of Weights and Measures Bill . 3090

Columns

22—Monday, 13th August, 1956—Contd.

ational Highways Bill—
  Motion to consider . . . 3091—3194
  Clauses 2 to 10, Schedule and clause 1 . . . 3205
  Motion to pass, as amended . . . 3205
Motions *re* : Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules . . . 3205—50
Daily Digest . . . 3251-52

No. 23 – Tuesday, 14th August, 1956.

Papers laid on the Table . . . 3253-54, 3255
emands for Supplementary Grants, 1956-57 . . . 3254
emands for Excess Grants, 1951-52 . . . 3254
mands for Supplementary Grants, 1956-57 (Travancore-Cochin) . . . 3255
ommittee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions
  Fifty-eighth Report . . . 3255
lectricity (Supply) Amendment Bill—
  Motion to refer to Select Committee . . . 3256—3349
Multi-Unit Co-operative Societies (Amendment) Bill—
  Motion to consider as passed by Rajya Sabha . . . 3349—63
  Clauses 1 and 2 . . . 3363
  Motion to pass . . . 3363-64
Indian Lac Cess (Amendment) Bill—
  Motion to consider as passed by Rajya Sabha . . . 3364—86
  Clauses 1 to 5 . . . 3386-87
  Motion to pass . . . 3387
Indian Cotton Cess (Amendment) Bill—
  Motion to consider as passed by Rajya Sabha . . . 3388—94
Half-an-Hour Discussion *re*: Flood-affected displaced persons in Agartala . . . 3394—3408
Daily Digest . . . 3409-10

No. 24 – Thursday, 16th August, 1956.

Death of Shri Shiva Dayal Upadhyay . . . 3411
Arrest of a Member . . . 3411—13
Papers laid on the Table . . . 3413-14
Rules Committee—
  Fifth Report . . . 3414
Public Accounts Committee—
  Eighteenth Report . . . 3414
Calling attention to matter of urgent Public Importance—
  Effect of drought on crops in Bihar and Eastern U.P. . . . 3414—18
Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill, as reported by Joint Committee—
  Motion to consider . . . 3418—3556
Clauses 2 to 4 and new Clause 4A. . . . 3557—78
Daily Digest . . . 3579-80

No. 25 – Friday, 17th August, 1956.

Papers laid on the Table . . . 3581
Message from Rajya Sabha . . . 3582
Petition *re*: Indian Railways Act and rules thereunder . . . 3582

Columns

No. 25—Friday, 17th August, 1956—Contd.

- Business of the House . . . 3582-83, 3758
- Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill—
  - Clauses 3 to 51, Schedule and Clause 1 . . . 3583—3694
  - Motion to pass, as amended . . . 3695—3702
- Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—
  - Fiftyeighth Report . . . 3702
- Resolution *re* Control and Regulation of Production and Exhibition of Films . 3703—57
- Resolution *re* Appointment of Committee on working of Directive Principles of State Policy . . . 3757-58
- Daily Digest . . . 3759-60

No. 26—Monday, 20th August, 1956.

- Motion for adjournment—
  - Situation in Ahmedabad . . . 3761—63
- Papers laid on the Table . . . 3764
- Message from Rajya Sabha . . . 3764
- Newspaper (Price and Page) Bill . . . 3765
- Arrest of Members . . . 3765
- Resignation of Member . . . 3766
- Indian Cotton Cess (Amendment) Bill—
  - Motion to consider, as passed by Rajya Sabha . . 3766—73
  - Clauses 2 to 5 and 1 . . . 3773
  - Motion to pass . . . 3773
- Indian Coconut Committee (Amendment) Bill—
  - Motion to consider . . . 3773—3801
  - Clauses 2 to 4 and 1 . . . 3801
  - Motion to pass, as amended . . . 3801—04
- Supreme Court (Number of Judges) Bill—
  - Motion to consider . . . 3804—28
  - Clauses 1 and 2 . . . 3828
  - Motion to pass . . . 3828—30
- Jammu and Kashmir (Extension of Laws) Bill—
  - Motions to consider and to pass . . . 3830
- Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill—
  - Motion to consider as passed by Rajya Sabha . . . 3831—43
  - Clauses 1 to 3 . . . 3843
  - Motion to pass . . . 3843
- Business of the House . . . 3843—47, 3909-10
- Demands for Supplementary Grants, 1956-57 . . . 3847—3909
- Daily Digest . . . 3911—14

No. 27—Wednesday, 22nd August, 1956.

- Rules Committee—
  - Minutes of a sitting . . . 3915
- Detention of a Member . . . 3915, 3917—20
- Paper laid on the Table . . . 3916
- Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—
  - Fifty-ninth Report . . . 3916
- Petition *re* Motor Vehicles Act . . . 3917

Columns

No. 27—Wednesday, 22nd August, 1956—Contd.

Demands for Excess Grants, 1951-52 . . . . 3920—56

Motion *re* Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules . . 3957—4050

Government Premises (Eviction) Amendment Bill, as reported by Select Committee . . . .

Motion to consider . . . . 4050—82

Daily Digest . . . . 4083—84

No. 28—Thursday, 23rd August, 1956.

Paper laid on the Table 4085

Appropriation (No. 3) Bill . . . . 4085—86

Appropriation (No. 4) Bill 4086

Government Premises (Eviction) Amendment Bill, as reported by Select Committee—

Motion to consider . . . . 4087—4181

Clauses 2 to 6, and Clause 1 . . 4181—88

Motion to pass, as amended . . 4188

Motion *re* Situation in Naga Hills . . 4189—4242

Daily Digest . . . . . 4243—44

No. 29—Friday, 24th August, 1956.

Paper laid on the Table 4245

Appropriation (No 3) Bill; and . . . . . 4245—46

Appropriation (No. 4) Bill . . . . . . 4246—47

Business of the House . . . . . . 4247—49

Government Premises (Eviction) Amendment Bill—

Motion to pass as amended . . . . . 4249—84

State Financial Corporation (Amendment) Bill—

Motion to consider . . . . . 4284—4303

Indian Railways (Amendment) Bill—

Motion to consider as passed by Rajya Sabha . . . 4303—28

Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions—

Fifty-ninth Report . . . . 4328—29

Central Government Servants (Option for Joining Contributory Health Service Scheme) Bill 4329

Women's and Children's Institutions Licensing Bill—

Motions to consider and to refer to Select Committee . 4329—39, 4370—71

Constitution (Amendment of the Sixth Schedule) Bill—

Motion to consider . . . . . . 4339—44

Criminal Law Amendment Bill—

Motion to consider . . . 4345—69, 4371—88

Daily Digest . . 4389-90

No. 30—Saturday, 25th August, 1956.

Business of the House . . . 4391—94

Message from Rajya Sabha . . 4394

Indian Medical Council Bill . . 4394

Business Advisory Committee—

Fortieth Report . . . . 4395 .

Resignation of a Member 4395

Suppression of Immoral Traffic in Women and Girls Bill—

Motion to refer to Select Committee . . . . . 4395—99

Columns

No. 30—Saturday, 25th August, 1956—Contd.

Children Bill, as passed by Rajya Sabha—

Motion to refer to Select Committee . . . . 4399—4400
Women's and Children's Institutions Licensing Bill . . . . . 4400—02

Indian Railways (Amendment) Bill, as passed by Rajya Sabha—

Clauses 2 and 1 . . . . 4402—42
Motion to pass 4442

Indian Institute of Technology (Kharagpur) Bill—

Motion to consider . . . . . . 4442—4516
Clauses 2 to 31 and 1 . . . . . . 4516—33
Motion to pass, as amended . . . . . 4533—36

Standards of Weights and Measures Bill—

Motion to refer to Joint Committee . . . . 4536—38
Daily Digest . . . . 4539—40
Index . . . . 1—39

LOK SABHA

Tuesday, 7th August, 1956

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Ganga Bridge Project

*784. **Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government propose to give preference in recruitment to local men whose lands had been acquired for Ganga Bridge Project without in any way sacrificing the question of merit and past experience ; and

(b) the percentage of local and outside persons employed as unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled labourers at present ?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shah Nawza Khan) : (a) Yes.

(b) A statement giving the information is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 1.]

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad : From the statement it is evident that the proportion between locals and outsiders is very great not only in the skilled and semi-skilled categories, but even in the unskilled category there is a great difference. May I know what are the reasons for this—whether persons are not available or it is the monopoly of some other section ?

Shri Shahnawza Khan : I might inform the hon. Member that although there is a lot of difference in the numbers as between the locals and the outsiders with regard to unskilled labour, the majority of the unskilled outsiders do not come from other States ; they come either from Patna or other districts of Bihar.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: May I know whether it is a fact that in the unskilled labour, not only employed by the project authorities but also by the contractors, large numbers are not from Patna or Mokameh but from outside the State ; is it a fact or not ?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan : As far as the Railways are concerned, most of the unskilled labour that we employ comes from the other parts of Bihar. About the labour employed by the contractors we do not have any particular information.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad : I want to know the reasons why they are from outside the State.

Mr. Speaker : Order, order. My predecessor, Shri Mavalankar, refused to allow such questions in the original—as to what are the States, what are the communities and so on. Now, is it the contention of the hon. Member that with respect to the Centrally administered subjects they ought to be only from one State ? Now, this is a matter of Railways, it is not Bihar State.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad : May I know from the Chair if it is the ruling that we are not entitled to ask whether in such projects which are in a particular State, where people have sacrificed their lands and orchards and everything, they should have no right to get employment? It is the general concern of the Government of India, not mine.

Mr. Speaker : That is not the question put. In view of unemployment etc., why not provide employment to the local people ? that is another matter. But to say with respect to Centrally administered things that it should be only from one particular area, is too big a proposition. If the question had been put I would not have allowed it, in accordance with the rules already laid down by the previous Speaker. Of course, unemployment is a a problem which has to be relieved whether in a State or in the whole of India. But to pursue it as if the Centrally administered matters must be confined to a particular State or States, does not seem to be proper.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Should there be none from the local place ?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is swinging the pendulum to the other side too much.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad : May I know whether any facilities have been provided so far for giving work to all those who have voluntarily given their lands and many other things for for project ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): The authorities, the local officers who do this recruitment, have been asked to bear this in mind that those whose lands have been taken away —"taken away" means not for nothing, they have been paid ample compensation—even so, they should be considered for employment provided they are suitable.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know what was the procedure adopted and the organisation set up to recruit all these categories of labour there ?

Shri Alagesan: A committee of officers attached to the project makes this recruitment.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: May I know how many persons drawing more than Rs. 500 are from the State of Bihar and from other States ?

Shri Alagesan: I should like to have notice.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: May I know what is the percentage and relationship of such officers who are drawing above Rs. 300 and above Rs. 500 ?

The Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Sir, may I say a word ? As you have rightly said, under the Constitution it is not possible for us to make any discrimination, in the matter of recruitment, between one State and another. But this matter was referred to me by some hon. Members of Bihar. And we took special care to instruct our General Manager, who is in charge of that project, to see to it that as many local men as possible should be recruited and should be absorbed. And the result has been quite satisfactory. In the statement placed on the Table of the House it has been said with regard to the unskilled category that the percentage of the local men is 39 per cent and that of the outsiders 61 per cent. Out of this 61 per cent of outsiders, I might inform the hon. Member that the majority are from Bihar. They may not be belonging to the area round about the Mokamehghat Bridge, but they come from Bihar, and their percentage is about ninety. So hon. Members will see that local people have been given preference.

As regards officers, of course it depends; the Railways have to transfer officers from one place to another for the respective projects. It is not possible for us to confine ourselves to the Bihar State only. There is nothing like Bihar Railway. There is the Eastern Railway or the North-Eastern Railway, and those Railways are spread over a number of States. Therefore, it is not possible for us to confine ourselves to the selection of officers from the Bihar State only.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Does it apply all over the country the same way ?

Mr. Speaker: It must apply.

Shri Jaipal Singh: While under the Constitution there can be no embargo on the movement of labour, do Government accept the principle that generally they would employ local labour ?

Mr. Speaker: They have employed 90 per cent.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I said local labour.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members must once again look into the rules. The Question Hour ought not to be used for the purpose of eliciting a policy from the Minister. The hon. Member asked : is it the rule or policy ?

So far as this matter is concerned, it has already been said that though not within the radius of five miles or so, 90 per cent of the people have been taken from the State of Bihar. We will stop at that stage.

Fertilizers and Chemicals Ltd., Alwaye

*786. **Shri A. K. Gopalan**: Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state :

(a) the nature of demands raised by the employees of Messrs Fertilizers and Chemicals Ltd., Alwaye, Travancore-Cochin State in their Memorandum to the management; and

(b) the steps Government propose to take to meet these demands ?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): (a) According to the information received from the State Government the demands of the workers are as follows —

(1) Bonus for the years 1954 and 1955.

(2) Gratuity.

(3) Revision of pay scales.

(4) Increased dearness allowance.

(5) Abolition of contract system.

(6) Confirmation of certain grades of employees.

(7) Creation of additional posts etc.

(b) Attempts at conciliation by State Government Officers having failed, the dispute was referred for adjudication on 19-4-56.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: May I know whether one of the demands is as far as the contract system is concerned, and may I know whether Government have proposals to abolish the contract system and take up the work departmentally ?

Shri Abid Ali: This matter has been referred to adjudication. It is one of the items there.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I want to know how the dearness allowance of the workers at Alwaye compares with that of workers in

Sindri doing identical work, and also how the working class cost of living index at Alwaye compares with that of Sindri.

Shri Abid Ali : The hon. Member can give notice for that.

Mr. Speaker : That does not arise straightaway from this question.

Punctuality of Trains

*787. **Shri Dabhi** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 2338 on the 18th May, 1956 and state to what extent the punctuality percentage for mail and passenger trains fixed by the Estimates Committee had been observed by the broad, metre and narrow gauge trains on the Western Railway during the months of April, May and June, 1956 ?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan) : A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 2].

Shri Dabhi : The targets fixed by the railways for punctuality of mail and express trains is 85 per cent. But the actual percentage of punctuality on broad-gauge in April, May and June are 69·3, 57·8 and 63·3 per cent respectively. May I know why there is so much difference ?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan : The months of April, May and June are generally such months whe the punctuality of trains suffers due to various factors—summer time conditions. At that time there is very heavy despatch of perishables and there are marriage parties. During this period there is a lot of chain pulling also.

Shri Dabhi : May I know the comparative figures for the previous three months, namely, January, February and March to see whether there was any improvement during that period ?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan : I require notice.

Shri Boovaraghasamy : May I know whether it is not a fact that many mail and passenger trains run behind the schedule of time because of the supply of very bad and old engines ?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan : We do not supply very bad and old engines deliberately. It is but natural that occasionally there may be delay due to engine trouble.

Shri U. M. Trivedi : May I know whether it is not a fact that since February this year up to date there is hardly a day when the trains running from Ahmedabad to Delhi are not late ? Is there any reason for this persistence ?

The Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri) : It is a question of fact. I do not know whether the hon. Member is quite correct in stating that that train has been running late every day. If he wants, I am prepared to look into the matter.

फल और शाक विकास बोर्ड

*७८९. **श्री भक्त दर्शन** : क्या खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री २३ मई, १९५६ के तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या २४७८ के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या फल और शाक विकास बोर्ड की स्थापना के बारे में अन्तिम निर्णय कर लिया गया है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो उस बोर्ड के संगठन, कृत्यों व कार्यक्रम आदि की स्थूल रूप रेखा क्या है ;

(ग) यदि नहीं तो अब तक उस बारे में क्या प्रगति हुई है ; और

(घ) अन्तिम निर्णय कब तक हो जाने की आशा है ?

कृषि मंत्री (डा० पं० श० देशमुख) : (क) इस मामले पर शीघ्रता से विचार हो रहा है ।

(ख) प्रश्न उत्पन्न नहीं होता ।

(ग) एक उपसमिति बोर्ड के निर्माणार्थ नियमावली का मसविदा बनाने के लिये नियुक्त कर दी गई थी । उपसमिति की रिपोर्ट प्राप्त हो गई है और अन्तर्विभागीय समिति जल्दी ही उस पर विचार करेगी ।

(घ) इस वक्त समय की कोई निश्चित सीमा नहीं बताई जा सकती है ।

Mr. Speaker : He may now give the answer in English.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : (*a*) The matter is under active consideration.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) A Sub-Committee was appointed to prepare draft rules for the constitution of the Board. The report of the Sub-Committee has been received and will be considered by the Inter-Departmental Committee shortly.

(d) No definite time limit can be indicated at this stage.

श्री भक्त दर्शन : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि कितने समय से इस प्रश्न पर विचार हो रहा है और इसमें इतनी देरी होने के विशेष कारण क्या हैं ?

डा० पं० श० देशमुख : एक वक्त हमारी मिनिस्ट्री का ऐसा ख्याल था कि इसकी कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है । इस पर फिर गौर किया गया और मैं ने भी आश्वासन दिया था कि हम इस बारे में कुछ और सोचेंगे उसके मुताबिक अभी फैसला हुआ है कि हम यह बोर्ड बनायेंगे ।

श्री भक्त दर्शन : यह बोर्ड जो बनाया जा रहा है यह निजी रूप से सीधे कार्य करेगा या जो राज्यों में इस प्रकार के बोर्ड पहले से बने हैं उनसे अपने काम में सहायता लेगा ?

डा० पं० श० देशमुख : हमारी मिनिस्ट्री के काफी काम तो सूबों की सरकारें ही करती हैं । जहां तक डाइरेक्ट (सीधे) काम करने का सवाल है, हम यह बोर्ड कोआर्डिनेशन (समन्वय) के लिये ही बना रहे हैं ।

Sugar Cane

*790. **Shri Bibhuti Mishra**: Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) the quantity of sugarcane crushed in the various sugar factories in different States and sugar recovered out of that during 1955-56;

(b) whether Government have formulated any scheme to export sugar from surplus to deficit areas in the country; and

(c) if so, the period within which the scheme will be implemented?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): (a) A statement giving the required information is laid on the table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 3.]

(b) No. The movement will be undertaken by the trade.

(c) Does not arise.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : इस स्टेटमेंट को देखने से पता चलता है कि सारे देश में गन्ने की ईल्ड में दस परसेंट से देसी चीनी हुई है और इस वजह से क्या सरकार इस प्रश्न पर विचार कर रही है कि किसान को जो तीन आने मन गन्ने की कीमत में मई के बाद नुकसान उठाना पड़ा है उसे कुछ प्रान्तीय सरकार के सेस (उपकर) से, कुछ केन्द्रीय सरकार की एक्साइज ड्यूटी (उत्पादन-शुल्क) से और कुछ मिल वालों के मुनाफे में से काट कर पूरा किया जाये ।

खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री (श्री अ० प्र० जैन): ऐसा कोई विचार नहीं है कि एक्साइज ड्यूटी में से पैसा दिया जायेगा । जहां तक राज्यों के सेस का सम्बन्ध है, मेरी इत्तला है कि उनका भी कुछ देने का इरादा नहीं है । माननीय सदस्य को वह भी मालूम होना चाहिये कि जहां एक तारीख के बाद कीमत को रिकवरी (निकासी) से सम्बद्ध किया जाता है, तो जिस वक्त कीमतें ज्यादा होती हैं तो बोनस भी दिया जाता है ।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : जब ईल्ड कम होती है तब भी मिल वालों का मुनाफा उतना ही रहता है और सेस और एक्साइज ड्यूटी भी उतनी ही ली जाती है । केवल किसान को नुकसान होता है । क्या सरकार इस प्रश्न पर कुछ सोचेगी ?

श्री अ० प्र० जैन : यह तो माननीय सदस्य ने एक बहस तलब बात उठाई है जिसके ऊपर यहां आध घंटे तक बहस भी हो चुकी है । उस समय जो मामला था वह मैंने साफ कर दिया था ।

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : क्या उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ने गवर्नमेंट को लिखा है कि वह अपने सेस में से कुछ छोड़ने को तैयार है बशर्ते कि गवर्नमेंट एक्साइज ड्यूटी में से भी कुछ छोड़ने को तैयार हो ताकि किसानों को जो ईल्ड की कमी की वजह से नुकसान हुआ है वह पूरा किया जा सके ।

श्री अ० प्र० जैन : प्रान्तीय सरकारें हमको क्या लिखती हैं और हम उसके ऊपर क्या कार्यवाही करते हैं इसके सम्बन्ध में तो मैं

समझता हूं कि चर्चा करना ठीक नहीं होगा। लेकिन मैं यह भी बता दूं कि प्रान्तीय सरकार के पास से हमारे पास कोई ऐसी चिट्ठी आने वाले सीजन के बारे में नहीं आयी है।

Shri B. S. Murthy: Arising out of the question, may I know whether the Government have decided the areas and what steps are being taken to make them self-sufficient?

Shri A. P. Jain: We assess the sufficiency of the country as a whole not of the different areas. When granting licences we select more suitable areas and wherever sugar is needed we provide facilities for the transport from one part of the country to the other.

Shri Mohiuddin: May I know whether the Government has considered the possibility of adjusting the price in the early part of the season and the latter part of the season in such a way that when the yield of sugar-cane in the latter part of the season is less, the prices are so regulated that cultivators get the same price throughout the season?

Shri A. P. Jain: For the last few years the production of sugar-cane in the mill zones has been going up very rapidly. Probably, the cause for this rapid increase is the comparatively higher price of the sugar-cane that is being paid to the cane grower in the mill area. In fact we made some investigation and we found the price which the manufacturer of gur gets was 13 annas or 14 annas, the supplier to the sugar mills gets Rs. 1-7-0 or Rs. 1-5-0. The whole question is causing us a lot of......

An hon. Member: Headache.

Shri A. P. Jain Headache and we are thinking of working out some scheme—maybe that zones may have to be re-adjusted, maybe that some restrictions on suppliers of certain types may have to be imposed so that the cane is properly crushed. My own idea—and I am very well supported by the experts—is that the cane should normally be crushed only during the optimum period when the recovery is the highest and it is uneconomical to crush it when the recovery goes down. We are trying to work out a scheme on these lines.

Shri Shivananjappa: May I know whether the price is being fixed on the basis of the recovery?

Shri A. P. Jain: We appointed a Committee and that Committee has made recommendations. Those recommendations are under examination. But I may frankly state that I have the largest amount of sympathy with the proposition that the price of sugar-cane should be correlated with the recovery.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: May I know whether there has been any definite improvement in the matter of the assistance and co-operation given by the Railway Department, in regard to the transport of sugar to the needy areas?

Shri A. P. Jain: There was never any dislocation, and we are having more and more of co-operation.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : क्या सरकार रिकवरी (प्राप्ति) पर जब कीमत देने की बात ठीक कर रही है तो उसके पहले सब किसानों को अच्छी क्वालिटी (किस्म) के शुगरकेन (गन्ना) का बीज सप्लाई कर सकेगी ?

श्री अ० प्र० जैन : माननीय मेम्बर को यह मालूम होना चाहिए कि किसान को अच्छा बीज मुहैय्या करने के सम्बन्ध में जितना अच्छा काम गन्ने के सम्बन्ध में हुआ है उतना किसी दूसरी फसल के बारे में नहीं हुआ है और बराबर इस बात की कोशिश की जा रही है कि किसान को अच्छे से अच्छा बीज मिल सके और उन कोशिशों के फलस्वरूप जो गवर्नमेंट ने की हैं, गन्ने की पैदावार उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में ५० प्रतिशत अधिक बढ़ी है।

Food Production in the Second Plan Period

*792. **Shri H. N. Mukerjee**: Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that in regard to the raising of food Production targets in the Second Five Year Plan, differing statements have been made lately by the Prime Minister, by himself, by the Minister of Agriculture, and by spokesmen of the Planning Commission; and

(b) what, if any, is the agreed formulation?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): (a) It cannot be said that there is any basic contradiction between the views so far expressed on the question of raising the targets of agricultural production under the Second Five Year Plan as these views represent only tentative suggestions and not any final conclusions. In fact these suggestions constitute an essential part of the process of thinking connected with the formulation of the plan target.

(*b*) The matter is still under consideration.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee : I find it reported that, some two months ago, the former Finance Minister had indicated the possibility of exporting 4 million tons of foodgrains during the Second Five Yar Plan period to cover our foreign exchange deficits, while the Minister of Food and Agriculture thought that no more than a marginal increase in food production was possible with the present outlay. May I know the real position ?

The Minister of Food & Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : We have examined this question, and we have found as a result of a preliminary round of thinking that with the present allocations, only a marginal increase is possible. But we also took up the question of having more of allocations and increasing the food production as much as possible. Now, this is all the process of thinking, and the targets are fixed after considering the question at various levels.

For instance, we considered this question at Mussourie in a very broad way. The conclusions of the Mussourie conference are further going to be the subject-matter of discussion between the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and the Planning Commission. After they have discussed, there will be further deliberation between the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, the Planning Commission and the State Governments, and only then it will be possible to fix the final targets and also to determine whether any further allocations are to be made.

In fact, these are all the provisional and preliminary ideas that are being discussed at various levels.

Shri H. N. Mukherjee : Is there any truth in the report—I am quoting from the *Economic Weekly* of Bombay—that

> "At the meeting held at Mussourie lately, of Food Ministers, there were some corrections in ink made obviously at the last moment, referring to the proposed increase in the production of foodgrains by 16·5 million tons rather than 13·5 million tons, which was the printed figure."?

May I know why this last-minute change was done, and may I know whether it is desirable to have this kind of practice to make last-minute corrections in important official statements ?

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya : Wise men change their minds.

Shri A. P. Jain : That indicates a progressive and up-to-date way of thinking. In fact, I might give the hon. Member a little history, because probably he is referring to my inauguration speech. I had dictated the inauguration speech and then went to the south. Meanwhile, more thinking had been going on in the Ministry. When I returned, I found that targets had been properly worked out, and instead of a 13·5 million tons increase, an increase of 16·5 million tons or so was possible. When I reached Mussourie, I looked into my speech and I asked my officers about the change, and they said that as a result of fuller thinking, they had come to the conclusion that higher targets were possible. I do not see what is wrong about it. I want to deliver a speech, and I prepare a draft ; may be, it is cyclostyled. Then, I come to the conclusion, as a result of further thinking, that certain higher targets are possible. Surely, the hon. Member does not mean that I should stick to the old, outmoded and outdated targets.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar : A suggestion was made that a 40 per cent increase in production should be made. And it was said by the Minister that with the present investment contemplated in the Plan, it could not be done. May I know what targets are going to be fixed, and whether there is going to be an increase in the allotment ?

Shri A. P. Jain : On one thing everybody agrees, and that is that we must increase the production to the maximum extent, within the present allocations, and as much more as possible with further allocations that are available.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar : May I know whether Government are aware that many experts doubt whether this 40 per cent increase in the next five years is at all possible ?

Shri A. P. Jain : That question had better be addressed to experts.

Shri K. P. Tripathi : The working classes are getting only about 2,300 or 2,200 calories, whereas they should get over, 3,000 calories. Under these circumstances, before working out plans for export, will Government consider the question of giving a higher calorific value of food for consumption in India rather than sending it abroad ?

Shri A. P. Jain : The increase in the calorie consumtpion is a very complex process. It depends not only on foodgrains but on other things also. In fact, it is rather unfortunate that there is much larger consumption of foodgrains in India than what it ought to be. Higher Calory largely depends on the consumption of fruits, milk, fish, eggs, meat and other kinds of protective foods.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : Bur how to buy those things ? That is the problem.

Shri N. M. Lingam : The deficit financing part of the Second Five Year Plan is based on the possibility of increasing the food production by 40 per cent. Do Government contemplate revising the Plan, if it is eventually decided that it is not possible to have a 40 per cent increase in food production ?

Shri A. P. Jain : It is not a correct statement that the present Plan is based on a 40 per cent increase in food production. In fact, that was an idea that was mooted out by one of the members of the Planning Commission. Later on, it was supported by some other. A few others were diffident about it. That question is being examined.

Press Telegrams

*793. **Shri D. C. Sharma:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state the nature of the decisions arrived at between the Government of India and the Government of Japan with regard to the rates of Press telegrams in Japan ?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): The matter is still the subject of correspondence between the two Governments.

Shri C. D. Sharma: May I know whether it is the intention of Government to scale down the rates or to scale up the rates ?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: For a scaling down.

Shri D. C. Sharma: May I know whether the rates for press telegrams to the Middle East countries and to other Far East countries are also undergoing any change, and if so, what the nature of that change is ?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I presume the hon. Member is aware that for the Commonwealth countries, we have concession rates for the press. For the Asian countries also, we took up the matter, and we have been successful in having special concessional rates for press telegrams for the following countries, namely China, Indonesia, Thailand, Afghanistan and U.S.S.R. Negotiations with other Asian countries are going on.

Princess and Victoria Docks, Bombay

*794. **Shri Gidwani:** Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) the originally estimated cost of the proposal to remodel the Princess and Victoria Docks in Bombay and the proposed dredging operations in the harbour; and

(b) the revised estimated cost of both the proposals respectively ?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). The scheme for remodelling the Princess and Victoria Docks in Bombay was originally estimated to cost Rs. 4·5 crores. The present revised estimate based on certain tenders that have been received is likely to be about Rs. 11·6 crores exclusive of the effect of the escalation clause. As regards dredging operations, an estimate of cost will be possible only after the results of certain model experiments which are being carried out at the Central Water and Power Research Station at Poona have become available.

Shri Gidwani: What was the reason for the increased cost ?

Shri Alagesan: As I said, there are certain features in the revised estimate which have made the cost go up. Also, this is based on the tenders that have been received.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I understaned that some money will be spent on remodelling these docks. Am I to take it that even after such remodelling, the docks will continue to be called the Victoria Dock and Princess Dock ?

Mr. Speaker: What has remodelling to do with the names ? He may put a question separately. Is there any proposal to change the names ?

Shri Alagesan: We have not thought about it.

Shri Gidwani: May I know whether the increased amount has been sanctioned, and when the work of remodelling will start ?

Shri Alagesan: Certain recommendations have been made by the Bombay Port Trust which are under examination. It is too early to say when the work will be started. It will take some time before sanction is given and work is started.

Indian Official's Death in Rome

*795. **Shri Radha Raman:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that death of an official of the Union Food and Agriculture Ministry occurred in Rome in mysterious circumstances;

(b) if so, whether Government are in possession of facts or results of the investigations carried on in the matter under the joint supervision of the Indian Embassy in Rome and the F.A.O. headquarters regarding the death; and

(c) whether Government were taking any steps to compensate the family for the loss of the official's life ?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): (a) Yes.

(b) Not yet. The investigation is being conducted by the Italian Government.

(c) This will be examined on receipt of the final report on the circumstances leading to his death.

Shri Radha Raman: May I know for what purpose this official had gone to Rome and for how long he had been there previous to his mysterious death ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: He was sent as a research investigator in the Directorate of Economics and Statistics. He was deputed in January 1956 to Rome to attend the international training centre on agricultural economics which was to hold training from January 16 to May 12 1956, under the auspices of the F.A.O. of the U.N.

Shri Radha Raman: May I know whether there was a *post mortem* examination of the body, and if anything came out of that ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: According to my information, the police authorities in Rome are making the investigation.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know whether this official had completed the training, and if so, after completion why did he stay there ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: There was not a very large lapse of time. Actually, he should have completed his work on the 12th May 1956. He disappeared on the 13th, *i.e.* the next day.

Shri Radha Raman On behalf of the Indian Government, who is the person who is dealing with this investigation ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Evidently the Indian Ambassador in Rome must be keeping an eye on this.

Shri Radha Raman: What time will this investigation take, and have Government any information as to when the actual findings will be available ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: It is not possible for me to say.

Agro-Economic Research Centres

*796. **Shri Ram Krishna:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 1524 on the 27th April, 1956 and state whether Government have decided about the location of the new two Agro-Economic Research Centres?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): No final decision has yet been taken in the matter.

Shri Ram Krishna: May I know by what time the decision will be taken?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I do not think it is worthwhile making any guess. We will try to expedite it.

Shri B. S. Murthy: What are the factors that caused the delay ?

Mr. Speaker: We are not going to be better off by having the answer to it.

Turbo-Jet Aircrafts

*797. **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government propose to purchase Turbo-Jet aircrafts for civil aviation ; and

(b) if so, the estimated cost thereof?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) and (b). The Air India International Corporation has submitted a proposal for the purchase of 3 Boeing 707 jet aircraft at an estimated cost of Rs.11·5 crores. The proposal is under consideration of the Government.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: May I know whether the Minister is in a position to tell us whether these aircraft are more serviceable than other aircraft ?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: They will be more modern. Every airline tries to possess the most up-to-date aircraft.

Shri Krishnacharya Joshi: What are the special facilities provided in these aircraft ?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: The special facilities are that the plane carries a larger number of passengers and more freight and it will be pressurized and more comfortable.

Indian Airlines Corporation

*799. **Shri Jaipal Singh:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state :

(a) the terms of appointment of the air-crew of the Indian Airlines Corporation ;

(b) the number of Commercial Pilots in active employment of the Corporation;

(c) the manner of their periodical check and further training ; and

(d) the designation of the personnel responsible for the check and training ?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) to (d). [I lay on the Table of the Lok Sabha a statement giving the required information. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 4].

Shri Jaipal Singh: In regard to (a), may we know whether the appointments are on a contract basis ? If so, what are the terms of the contract?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: The Corporation has drafted rules in this connection, and up till now I think the appointments are on contract basis.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Is it a fact that notice of termination is one month only?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am not quite sure whether it is one month or three months.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know whether in recruiting these pilots, preference is given to the boys who have got the Dakota endorsement from the civil aviation training centre in Allahabad?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: There is no question of preference. Dakota endorsement training is given only at Allahabad.

Shri G. S. Singh: The other day in answer to a starred question, it was said that there are 17 Indian licensed pilots flying outside the country. May I know what machinery the D.G.C.A. has for enforcing the rules laid down in part (*c*) of the statement laid on the Table?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: The machinery is that when they have to renew their licences, they will have to apply to the D.G.C.A. Their licences will be renewed only if they fulfil all the necessary conditions for renewal.

Shri Jaipal Singh: The other day the hon. Minister was not present here, when on his behalf the Minister of Natural Resources answered a starred question I had tabled. It was in regard to Dakota being lent to operate in foreign countries. May I ask how the checking is done? Are these checks made in this country or do the people who do the checking have to go to other countries?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am not quite sure. But it may be that in those countries where they have got the department of civil aviation fully developed, we might have some arrangement for the checking by the officers of the civil aviation department of that country. Or it may be that occasionally when the aircraft come here—and the pilots do come along with them—the test may be carried out here.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: The hon. Minister has misunderstood my question. Certain boys are selected by Government to be trained in the C.A.T.C. I was asking whether in giving Dakota endorsement licence, preference was given to these C.A.T.C. boys or to boys of the other flying clubs in India.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: That was not the question she put. But now she has twisted it like that. The question at that time was quite clear, whether in the matter of recruitment, preference was shown to boys of this centre.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: The hon. Minister has made a presumption. This is not the way to answer a question.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: It is for you, Sir, to decide whether this is different from the other question.

Mr. Speaker: The decision is that the hon. Minister may kindly answer this question. This may be different from the other. It does not matter.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: A different supplementary may be put. But the point is whether the previous question can be interpreted in this way.

Mr. Speaker: She understood it that way.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I have nothing to say if you also agree with that interpretation.

Mr. Speaker: The Member who puts the question understands it in one way. It is open to the person who hears it to understand it in a different way. Therefore, such a difference has arisen in this case. It has now been set right. She only wanted to put in clearer terms later on what was in her mind then. Therefore, she is not wrong. The hon. Minister also is not wrong. Now, let him answer the question.

Mr. Lanka Sundaram: He can try to answer.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: There is no question of trying to answer. The question is very simple. In the case of such difference your authority is final.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Now, what is the answer?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: In so far as the question of selection of candidates for taking training for the Dakota endorsement is concerned, certain procedures have been laid down. But the selection will depend upon various factors like educational qualifications and also flying hours to the credit of the candidate. Those who have better educational qualifications and a higher number of flying hours to their credit are given preference whether they are from Flying Clubs or from the C.A.T.C.

Digboi Oil Company

***800. Shri Rishang Keishing:** Will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that many employees in the Digboi Oil Company were retrenched or dismissed during 1955;

(b) the number of the employees affected;

(c) whether the affected employees put up a representation to the Minister of Labour during his last visit to Digboi for their re-employment; and (*d*) if so, the action that the Minister has taken in this connection ?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali) : (a) and (b). In August 1955, the Assam Oil Company Labour Union submitted two applications to Government asking for reference to a Tribunal of 37 cases of alleged wrongful dismissal or discharge of workers.

(c) A memorandum on behalf of the workers of the Assam Oil Company and their Union was presented to the Labour Minister when he visited Digboi in March 1956.

(d) The cases were examined and it was considered that justification did not exist for referring them to a Tribunal. The Union had already been informed accordingly.

Shri Rishang Keishing : May I know whether the question of re-employment of the workers has been considered by Government ?

Shri Abid Ali : The question of re-employment by Government does not arise; they were not employees of Government.

Shri Rishang Keishing : In view of the fact that there have been discoveries of new wells and there has been marked expansion of the industry, how did Government allow the company to retrench labourers like this ?

Shri Abid Ali : Some of these workers were dismissed or discharged because of unfitness on medical grounds, theft, violation of the standing order etc. ; some were also discharged with the permission of the Labour Appellate Tribunal.

Shri Sadhan Gupta : Since it is a case of retrenchment or dismissal on certain allegations, may I know whether the Labour Minister had conducted full-scale enquiry after hearing both sides and had decided as a Tribunal would decide ?

Shri Abid Ali : That was done by the Regional Labour Commissioner and we decided on the basis of the report submitted by him. We were satisfied with his recommendations.

Shri B. S. Murthy : May I know who decides the question of unfitness — is it the management or the management in consultation with the Regional Labour Commissioner ?

Shri Abid Ali : The Regional Labour Commissioner went into the details of every individual case and submitted his recommendations accordingly.

Shri Rishang Keishing : Is it a fact that the retrenched labourers represented their case to the Minister of Labour when he visited Digboi and the Minister advised the labourers to approach through some labour leaders like Shri Tripathi ? If so, why the Minister in charge of Labour hesitated to deal with the matter direct and advised them to approach through some political workers ?

Shri Abid Ali : So far as the first part of the question is concerned, I have already replied in the affirmative. As for the second part, I do not think the labour Minister will give such an advice. He generally advises that the workers should approach through their Unions.

Homoeopathy

***801. Shri S. C. Samanta** : Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2557 on the 28th May, 1956 and state :

(a) the reasons for not spending any amount on the development of Homoeopathy during 1955-56 ;

(b) whether the amount sanctioned for the First Five Year Plan will be brought forward or it will lapse ; and

(c) the programmes of development during the Second Five Year Plan ?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar) : (a) The schemes submitted by State Governments and various institutions during that year were not considered suitable for grants from the Central Government.

(b) The amount lapsed with the close of the First Five Year Plan period.

(c) The proposed programmes during the Second Five Year Plan are :—

1. Upgrading of Homoeopathic Colleges .	Rs. 26 lakhs.
2. Grants for 20 Research Beds at 4 Centres .	Rs. 8 lakhs.
3. Homoeopathic Pharmacopoeia . .	Rs. 0.50 lakhs.
Total Rs.	34·50 lakhs.

Shri S. C. Samanta : The hon. Minister said in answer to part (b) of the question that the money allotted for homoeopathic development will lapse at the end of the First Five Year Plan. May I know whether Government is responsible for not pursuing the schemes with the institutions which were asked to submit them in time ?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar : It is not the mistake of the Government of India. We have been writing since March 1954 to the various State Governments to send the proposals for research schemes. They took their own time and only two State Governments sent replies and when the schemes were sent to the Central Government, they were scrutinised by the Advisory Committee which consisted of homoeopathic doctors as well ; they were found lacking in detail

So, the State Governments were asked to send revised schemes. When they again sent the schemes, they were not quite properly framed. So, again, they were asked to send the schemes. Now, we have received a reply from the West Bengal Government saying that they will discuss with the Dave Committee members and then send proposals. So, the blame does not lie with the Central Government.

Shri S. C. Samanta : May I know whether the Rs. 2 lakhs sanctioned for the Model Homoeopathic Institution at Calcutta was sanctioned from the First Five Year Plan or the Second Five Year Plan ?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar : It is from the Second Five Year Plan ; it is for 1956-57.

Shri S. C. Samanta : Is it not a fact that this institution applied some three or four years back and correspondence was going on ? May I know why money was not sanctioned in the First Five Year Plan ?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar : The hon. Member has been corresponding with the Ministry of Health about this institution and he himself knows that the colleges in Bengal did not come to any conclusion as to which of the colleges should be upgraded. So, the mistake, even now, does not lie with the Central Government.

Central Tobacco Research Institute

*802. **Dr. Rama Rao** : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state :

(a) what steps have been taken to improve the equipment and facilities at the Central Tobacco Research Institute at Rajahmundry;

(b) what is the programme to afford proper storage facilities for tobacco growers in Rajahmundry, Guntur and other places;

(c) the actual steps taken for the same; and

(d) what facilities have been provided for giving short training for tobacco growers for growing, curing and storing tobacco?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh) : (a) Farmsteads and farm buildings have already been provided and the laboratory building is nearing completion. In addition, provision to the extent of Rs. 6,35,000 has been made in the Second Five Year Plan to improve and modernise the laboratory facilities at the Central Tobacco Research Institute, Rajahmundry.

(b) and (c). Storage facilities for tobacco are expected to be provided by the State Warehousing Corporation when established.

(d) Training in flue-curing to those interested in learning the technique has been in vogue at the Institute for some years. A scheme for imparting elaborate training to tobacco-curers, growers, extension staff, National Extension Service and Community Project Staff has been provided under the Second Five Year Plan and will be operating with effect from the 1956-57 crop season.

Dr. Rama Rao: The Minister said that Rs. 6,35,000 have been provided for the Second Plan. How much of this amount is being spent for machinery and equipment of this institute ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : For equipping the laboratory and library including furniture, apparatus etc. there is a provision of Rs. 2,30,000.

Dr. Rama Rao : May I know how much machinery has been ordered and how much has been received and at what stage the equipment is ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Equipment worth about 796 is being obtained under the U.S. Technical Aid Programme. I have not got any further details about it.

Dr. Rama Rao : May I know whether this research institute looks after only the curing aspect of tobacco or the growing aspect also including selecting seeds and manuring etc. ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : So far as I am aware, I think it is also concerned with the growing aspect but I could not be quite definite at this moment. I should like to have notice.

Wheat

*803. **Shri B. D. Pande** : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state :

(a) what sort of new wheat N. P. 718 is which has been evolved at the Indian Agricultural Research Institute ; and

(b) whether it is more productive than other varieties that we already have in the country ?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh) (a) and (b). Wheat N.P. 718 is an early ripening and high yielding variety with excellent grain quality. It has done particularly well in Delhi State, Rajasthan, parts of Orissa and PBPSU, where it has been extensively tried and found to give 2-3 maunds higher yield per acre than the local, varieties of wheat.

Shri B. D. Pande : May I know if this wheat has also been tried in the colder regions of the Himalayas ?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Yes, Sir, in some places, I think, but I speak subject to correction.

Family Planning

***805. Shri Amjad Ali:** Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the rhythm method for family planning has, on survey, been found unsatisfactory and proved unsuccessful;

(b) if so, whether Government are now in favour of chemical and not mechanical contraceptives for the purpose; and

(c) whether it is a fact that Government have decided to distribute "free foam" tablets as a part of the drive to check the growth of population?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar): (a) Expert opinion is that, where properly followed, the rhythm method is as effective as any other.

(b) and (c). Government are giving a trial to the foam tablet and these will be distributed free of cost in our clinics to those who cannot afford to pay.

Shri Amjad Ali: May I know the classes of persons and the States on whom the survey was made?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar: The pilot schemes were carried out in an urban area, in Lodi Colony in Delhi, and another in a rural area at Ramanagram in Mysore State.

Shri Amjad Ali: Was any method tried for educating the public mind in this matter?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar: In the First Five Year Plan there were some films shown—at least one was shown—and some posters were brought out for educating the people in this respect. Now we have taken up detailed schemes to educate the people by publicity vans, educational films, posters to be written in important regional languages etc. It is also proposed to start a popular journal on family planning in 12 regional languages to be distributed free of cost.

Dr. Rama Rao: It is usually accepted that a combination of chemical with mechanical contraceptives is the best remedy. In view of that, do Government contemplate distributing some suitable mechanical contraceptives along with these foam tablets?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar: According to the expert opinion by which we are guided, we are distributing these foam tablets, but what the hon. Member has stated is a suggestion for the Ministry to take up.

Shri Gidwani: Is it a fact that Government propose to set up a training centre for family planning for training medical men and social workers, and may I know when such a centre will be started and where?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar: An All India Institute for Training and Research in Family Planning problems has been sanctioned and it is going to be started. It will train doctors, nurses and health visitors in the family planning problems.

Transport Advisory Council

***806. Shri Tulsidas:** Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) whether representations have been received to include non-officials on the Transport Advisory Council; and

(b) the action taken thereon?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) Yes.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

Shri Tulsidas: May I know why non-officials have not been included on the Transport Advisory Council although representations have been made?

Shri Alagesan: This matter was considered both by the Transport Advisory Council and by the Study Group that recently went into this question. The Transport Advisory Council being a body composed of Government representatives, State and Central, it will not help free and frank discussion to have non-official representatives on that body. That was the main reason. There is another reason that in the actual working of road transport and in the quasi-judicial bodies that function in the States, there is representation for non-officials. Previously it was, therefore, thought that there was no need for giving representation to non-officials on the Transport Advisory Council, but now that a representation is made, I am prepared to look into the question afresh to see whether they can be associated with the functioning of the Council.

Explosion in Noamandi

***808. Shri P. C. Bose:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there was heavy casualty involving death and serious injury to labourers in an explosion in the magazine of the Tata's Iron Ore Mine at Noamandi that took place on 15th July, 1956;

(b) the cause of the explosion;

(c) the number of dead and injured;

(d) whether an enquiry has been held into the matter; and

(e) if so, the findings thereof?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): (a) Yes.

(b) This is being investigated by the Chief Inspector of Explosives and his findings are awaited. It is not a mining accident.

(c) Seven persons were killed, two received serious injuries and seventeen received minor injuries.

(d) An enquiry was held by an officer of the Mines Department on 16-7-56. It was reported that the accident occurred in an explosive magazine which comes under the scope of the Indian Explosive Act and not under Mines Act. The enquiry is being held by the Chief Inspector of Explosives.

(e) These are awaited.

Shri P. C. Bose : When is the report of this enquiry expected to be received by Government?

Shri Abid Ali : The report will go to the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply; it will not be received by the Labour Ministry.

Shri Nambiar : May I know whether any compensation has been given to the families concerned?

Shri Abid Ali : Certainly, according to law they will get the compensation due to them.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad : As there are as many as seven dead, I would like to know whether any interim relief has been given by the Government or by others to the families who have suffered.

Shri Abid Ali : I do not think there is any interim relief given so far, but we will look into the matter and write to the employers, Tata Company. I am sure they will attend to it if they have not already done so.

Shri P. C. Bose : May I know whether any action will be taken against the authorities concerned if any violation of the rules regarding the magazine is found?

Shri Abid Ali : Certainly action will be taken if it is called for.

Milk Production

*809. **Shri U. M. Trivedi** : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state :

(a) whether the milk production has increased after 1947 and if so, what is the increased ratio; and

(b) whether this has been due to the improved breed of milch cattle?

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh) : (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Shri U. M. Trivedi : What is the amount of powdered milk that has been imported in this country since 1947? Has it been on the increase?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : I am afraid I must ask for notice.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad : Since during this short period the demand for milk has been growing, may I know what attempts have been made by Government to fill the gap between supply and demand?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : As is evident, the country is progressing. We are consuming more foodgrains, and as such more milk is also required. Unfortunately owing to the loss of good breed cattle due to partition and various other factors, the milk yield per cow has diminished from 413 pounds to 366 pounds. On the other hand, the number of cattle has increased from 411 lakhs to 470 lakhs.

Shri U. M. Trivedi : May I know if the attention of the Government has been drawn to the enormous number of cattle being exported or rather smuggled out of Rajasthan into Pakistan?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : We have not had any report from the State Government of Rajasthan to that effect.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad : The hon. Minister has stated that the milk yield has gone down and the demand has gone up. But he has not told us what measures have been taken to improve the position, and that is the operative part of the question.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh : I admit I did not reply to that part of the hon. Member's question. There is provision for various schemes. There was provision for some schemes in the First Five Year Plan and there is also a large provision in the Second Five Year Plan. We are trying to establish various milk colonies, some processing industries which will convert milk, which is not at the present time being utilised, into dry powder milk and so on.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad *rose*—

Mr. Speaker : These are questions of a general nature. Plans have been published. When the Budget was under discussion, the Ministry of Food and Agriculture issued an Administration Report of the Ministry. A question of such details cannot be asked now.

Departmental Catering

*810. **Shri Veeraswamy** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the Departmental catering on the Southern Railway has been running at a loss;

(b) if so, the amount of loss incurred by the Southern Railway during the year 1955-56; and

(c) the steps taken to reduce the loss?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan) : (a) Yes.

(b) Approximately Rs. 1·4 lakhs.

(c) A statement is placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 5].

Shri Veeraswamy : May I know whether it is not a fact that the quality of the food that has been prescribed by the Railway Authorities and supplied in these restaurants is not in any way superior to the food supplied before the departmental catering was introduced, and if so, what steps did the Government take to improve the quality of the food?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : I was not able to follow the hon. Member completely, but the departmental catering of the Southern Railway was started some decades back and I do not know whether the hon. Member was aware of the quality of food supplied there before departmental catering was introduced. Normally the standard of departmental catering is slightly better than even the private catering standard. But I have been receiving some complaints that there has been some deterioration in the standard of departmental catering. We are looking into the matter.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER

Leakage of telegrams in Chandigarh

S. N. Q. No. 7. Shri Gidwani : Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is fact that there has been leakage of State secrets and instructions conveyed over the Telephone and Telegraph system in Chandigarh, Capital of Punjab State ;

(b) whether the Punjab Government has furnished information to the Government of India to that effect; and

(c) if so, the steps taken by Government in the matter?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram) : (a) No.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Howrah-Burdwan Main Line Electrification

***785. Shri T. B. Vittal Rao** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) the progress made in the construction work for electrification on Howrah-Burdwan main line upto the end of June, 1956; and

(b) whether the progress made is according to Schedule?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan) : (a) The overall progress of the work is 15 per cent.

(b) The work is going on according to schedule, except for some works which involve the use of imported materials.

बमरौली हवाई अड्डे पर हैंगर

***७८८. श्री रघुनाथ सिंह** : क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि बमरौली हवाई अड्डे (इलाहाबाद) के हैंगर तूफान के कारण गिर गये हैं ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो उनकी संख्या कितनी है और इसके फलस्वरूप कितनी क्षति हुई है ?

संचार मंत्री (श्री जगजीवन राम) : (क) नहीं श्रीमान् जी । तारीख ५ जून, सन् १९५६ को एक बहुत भारी तूफान के समय जब कि वायु की गति ७० मील प्रति घंटे की थी दो अर्ध बने विमानशालाओं के ढांचे उड़ गये थे ।

(ख) सरकार को इसके कारण कोई हानि नहीं हुई है क्योंकि उड़े हुये दोनों लोहे के ढांचों को कोई क्षति नहीं पहुंची और ठेके की शर्तों के अनुसार ठेकेदार को बिना किसी अतिरिक्त व्यय के ढांचे को फिर से बनाना होगा ।

Dairy Research Institute, Bangalore

***791. Shri Madiah Gowda**: Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) Organisation and functions of the Bangalore Dairy Research Institute after it has been converted into the Southern Regional Station;

(b) the changes effected in the number of cattle, personnel and the scope of research; and

(c) whether it is fully supplied with all laboratory equipment?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 6].

Reserve Stocks of Wheat in Delhi

***798. Sardar Iqbal Singh**: Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is a proposal to build a reserve stock of wheat of over one lakh tons for the requirements of Delhi; and

(b) if so, from where this wheat will be purchased?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) It is proposed to arrange supply of about 1 1/2 lakh tons of wheat for Delhi to meet the full requirements of the city upto the end of May, 1957;

(b) The supplies will be entirely of imported wheat.

Posts and Telegraphs Service with the People's Republic of China

***804. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy**: Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether negotiations have started with the People's Republic of China for an agreement to regulate Post and Telegraph services;

(b) if so, at what stage the negotiations are at present; and

(c) the time by which it is likely to be finalised?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) Yes

(b) Draft agreements received from the Chinese Government have been examined and alternative drafts are being sent to China for consideration by the Chinese Government.

(c) No definite date can be stated.

Industrial Training Institute

***807. Shri Thimmaiah**: Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Industrial Training Institute at Bangalore will be handed over to State Government; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): (a) Yes.

(b) It has been decided that the training facilities now provided in the centres run by the Directorate General of Resettlement & Employment should be integrated with similar facilities provided by the State Governments and that the administrative responsibility for running these centres should be transferred to them.

Chowkidars in Civil Aviation Department

***811. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty**: Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the hours of duty of chowkidars in Civil Aviation Department have been finalised; and

(b) whether it is a fact that this matter has been under consideration for six years and if so, what are the difficulties in coming to a decision?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) No, Sir.

(b) The question of fixation of duty hours of Chowkidars in the Civil Aviation Department has been engaging the attention of Government for some time. As any decision taken in respect of Civil Aviation Department employees was likely to have repercussions in other Ministries and Departments, it was necessary to have inter-departmental consultations before taking a decision. A tentative decision has recently been taken and it is hoped that final orders will be issued shortly.

Kamalpur Airport

***812. Shri Dasaratha Deb**: Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) the amount of land acquired by Government for the construction of Kamalpur airport near Manik Bhander in Tripura;

(b) whether compensation for the acquired land was paid in all cases; and

(c) if not, when it was expected to be paid?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram) : (a) 61 acres approximately.

(b) and (c). Necessary information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha.

Editor 'Kamgar'

*813. **Shri Ramananda Das :**
Shri Balmiki :
Shri G. L. Choudhary :

Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the post of Editor 'Kamgar' was advertised and some candidates were interviewed by Union Public Service Commission.

(b) whether it is also a fact that the said post was reserved for Scheduled Caste candidate;

(c) how many candidates were interviewed by the Union Public Service Commission including the Scheduled Castes and what were the qualifications of each of them;

(d) whether it is a fact that a Scheduled Caste candidate was not selected ; and

(e) if so, why?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali) : (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) to (e). The Commission's recommendations are still under Government's consideration and it will not therefore be appropriate to disclose them.

शिक्षुओं का प्रशिक्षण

*८१४. **श्री खू० चं० सोधिया** : क्या रेलवे मंत्री सभा पटल पर एक विवरण रखने की कृपा करेंगे जिस में यह दिखाया गया हो कि :

(क) जिन रेलवे वर्कशापों के साथ शिक्षुओं को प्रशिक्षित करने वाले प्राविधिक स्कूल सम्बद्ध हैं उनके नाम क्या हैं ;

(ख) इस समय विभिन्न पाठ्य-क्रमों में कितने शिक्षु भर्ती किये गये हैं ;

(ग) द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना-काल में ऐसे कितने नये स्कूल खोलने का विचार है;

(घ) उपर्युक्त अवधि में किन-किन स्कूलों का विस्तार किया जाने वाला है; और

(ङ) इस प्रकार के प्रशिक्षण पर कितना व्यय होने का अनुमान है ?

रेलवे तथा परिवहन मंत्री के सभा सचिव (श्री शाहनवाज खां) : एक बयान सभा-पटल पर रख दिया गया है। [देखिये परिशिष्ट ५, अनुबन्ध संख्या ७]

Price of Copra in Travancore-Cochin State

*815. **Shri Achuthan** : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state :

(a) the price of copra per candy in the first 6 months during 1954, 1955 and 1956 in the Alleppey, Cochin and Kozhikode markets;

(b) the economic price per candy of copra that is demanded or suggested by the Travancore-Cochin State Government, the Cocoanut Planters Association and the Indian Central Cocoanut Committee in 1955 and 1956; and

(c) the policy and steps taken or contemplated to raise the present level of price?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : (a) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 8].

(b) No economic price for copra has been suggested by the Indian Central Cocoanut Committee in 1955 and 1956.

(c) There have been no violent fluctuations in the prices of Copra during the last 1½ years. The current prices are roughly what they obtained during the year 1955 or in the first half of 1956. A restrictive import policy for cocoanuts and its products is already being followed for ensuring a fair price to cocoanut growers.

Mecheri-Mettur Railway Section

*816. **Shri S. V. Ramaswamy** : Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1888 on the 2nd May, 1956 and state :

(a) what steps are being taken to improve the Mecheri-Mettur Section of the Salam-Mettur line and Mettur Station; and

(b) what steps are being taken to terminate the old pre-Independence agreement between the Madras Government and the Railway Board and merge the Mecheri-Mettur line in the Indian Railways System?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) Some passengers amenity works for this section were provided for in the Works Programme for 1954-55, but these have not yet been executed, pending the concurrence thereto of the Madras Government. The matter is being pursued with that Government.

(b) This is being considered in consultation with the Madras Government.

Suspension of Transport System in Tripura

*817. **Shri Biren Dutt** : Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that during July, 1956 all transport system remained suspended for about a month in the State of Tripura;

(b) whether the roads damaged by the flood have been repaired; and

(c) the emergency measures taken by Government to construct permanent bridges all over the State, which have been washed away by the flood of 2nd June, 1956?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan) : (a) No, Sir. Traffic was held up at a few places for some days.

(b) Most of the damages have been repaired or diversions have been provided.

(c) The construction of permanent bridges in place of those heavily damaged by the floods will be taken up after the rainy season.

American Team of Experts on Indian Railways

*818. **Shri Bansal** :
Pandit D. N. Tiwary :
Sardar Akarpuri :
Dr. Ram Subhag Singh :

Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the American Team of Experts has submitted their Preliminary Report on the Indian Railways; and

(b) if so, what are their main recommendations?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) Yes.

(b) A statement is placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 9].

404 LSD

Railway Mail Service Staff

*819. **Shri Kamath** : Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that certain sections of Railway Mail Service staff have to work for more than twelve hours at a stretch on some trains; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram) : (a) Yes.

(b) Because it is not practicable in certain cases to limit the duration of the beat to 12 hours.

Rise in Prices in Assam

*820. **Shri Debendra Nath Sarma** : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state :

(a) the rise of the prices of (i) rice, (ii) mustard oil, (iii) pulses, (iv) wheat and (v) cloth in Assam since March, 1956; and,

(b) the steps taken by Government to check the rise of prices?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : (a) and (b). Complete information is not available and will be placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha when received.

Asia Pacific Forestry Commission

*821. **Shri M. Islamuddin** : Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1376 on 11th April, 1956 regarding regional survey of timber trends and prospect by the Asia Pacific Forestry Commission of Food and Agriculture Organisation and state :

(a) whether Government have started launching the required survey ;

(b) if not, when the survey is expected to be launched and completed; and

(c) the financial burden it will entail on Government?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) : (a) Not yet.

(b) This survey will be launched in the near future and will be completed in about 6 months.

(c) About Rs. 50,000/-.

Price of Rice in Madras State

***822. Shri C. R. Narasimhan :** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state :

(a) whether the price of rice is soaring in Madras State;

(b) if so, the extent and cause for the same; and

(c) the remedial measures taken and proposed to be taken in this regard?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain) (a) and (b). There has been an increase in the price of rice in Madras State, as in other parts of the country, even though the production of rice this year in the country has been about 1 million tons more than last year. There is generally a rise in price in this part of year which is the lean period. The other reasons for rise in prices are shortfall in production of millets during the last Kharif season increase of currency In circulation and bank advances and the speculative and hoarding tendencies. According to the report of the State Government the rise in the price of rice between January and June this year has been 14·2 % Some further rise has taken place since.

(c) Government have already taken the following measures to check the upward trend in the price of rice :

(i) Total ban on export of rice and other foodgrains;

(ii) Stoppage of purchases of foodgrains by Government in internal markets;

(iii) Issue of rice through fair price shops.

(iv) Issue of wheat freely from Central stocks in important centres; and

(v) Restriction on advances by scheduled Banks against stocks of rice and paddy.

Indo-Pak Agreement

***823. { Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad :**
Dr. Ram Subhag Singh :

Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) whether any agreement has been arrived at between the Governments of India and Pakistan for through booking of passengers;

(b) if so. the details thereof; and

(c) how that arrangement is working?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) No, but the matter is under active consideration of the two Governments.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

One-Man Tribunal

***824. Shri T. B. Vittal Rao :** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state :

(a) the stage at which the 'one-man tribunal' appointed in 1953 to go into certain grievances of railwaymen stands; and

(b) the steps taken by the Railway Board to expedite the award?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) and (b). The hon. Member will please refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1884 put by him in this House on 19-9-55. No further progress has been made since then.

Stoppage of Water Supply

***825. Shri Bibhuti Mishra :** Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Joint Water and Sewage Board of Delhi has stopped water supply to various areas in Delhi between 10 P.M. and 4 A.M.; and

(b) if so, the reason therefor?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar) : (a) The Water Supply in Delhi was stopped between the hours of 10 P.M. and 4 A.M.; from 2nd June, 1956 to 21st June. 1956.

(b) The reasons for such stoppage were:—

(i) To make it possible to meet the large demand for water at high pressure in the mornings during the hot weather, and

(ii) To avoid waste of water at night.

Kandla Port

***826. Shri D. C. Sharma :** Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 590 on the 9th March, 1956 and state :

(a) the progress that has been made for equipping Kandla port with the latest harbour control radar equipment; and

(b) the amount that has been spent so far in this direction ?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan) : (a) The harbour control radar equipment ordered from the United Kingdom in December 1955, is expected to be delivered in April, 1957.

(b) No expenditure has been incurred so far.

सांप काटने की दवा

***८२७. श्री रघुनाथ सिंह :** क्या स्वास्थ्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगी कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि पठानकोट से २१ मील दूर कांगड़ा-पठानकोट सड़क पर नागनी माता का मन्दिर है जिसकी भूमि में यह असर है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को जहरीले से जहरीले सांप ने काट लिया हो तो यहां की मिट्टी लगाने और पिला देने से वह व्यक्ति अच्छा हो जाता है ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या सरकार इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ अनुसंधान करना चाहती है ?

स्वास्थ्य उपमंत्री (श्रीमती चन्द्रशेखर) : (क) इस बारे में पंजाब सरकार ने रिपोर्ट दी है कि पठानकोट-कांगड़ा सड़क पर एक पुराने सेमल के पेड़ के नीचे नागनी माता का एक चबूतरा (न कि मन्दिर) है, जो तीन तरफ दीवारों से घिरा हुआ है और ऐसा कहा जाता है कि यदि वह व्यक्ति जिसको सांप ने डसा हो यहां की मिट्टी और नागनी माता के चबूतरे में बहने वाले झरने के पानी को घाव पर लगाये तो अच्छा हो जाता है ।

(ख) इस मामले की अभी छानबीन होनी है ।

Amalapuzhai-Shertallai Canal

***828. Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) when the construction of Amalapuzhai Shertallai (Travancore-Cochin State) Canal will be over;

(b) the stage at which the construction is at present;

(c) whether the slowness in the construction has affected the opposition of water of wells in the vicinity of the construction sites as will as growth of cocoanut gardens in the areas; and

(d) the steps Government propose to take to expedite construction of the Canal?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan): (a) The construction of this canal will be completed by the end of the Second Five Year Plan.

(b) Out of the total length of about 13 miles a length of about 8 miles was completed by the end of May, 1956. Works on the five R. C. bridges are in various stages of progress.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) A provision of Rs. 2 lakhs has been made by the State Government during the current financial year. The construction work on this canal is progressing satisfactorily.

Air Routes to Far East

***829. Sardar Iqbal Singh:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is proposed to open new routes to the Far East *i.e.*, Bombay-Madras-Singapore and Australia; and

(b) if so, when this route will be opened?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) and (b). Yes Sir, Air-India International propose to extend their Bombay-Madras-Singapore service to Australia in October, 1956.

Agricultural Meteorology

***830. Shri Krishnacharya Joshi:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) what is the future programme of work suggested by the expert Committee of Agriculture Meteorology set up by Government; and

(b) what are the main recommendations accepted by the Government?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) An Expert Committee on Agricultural Meteorology has been appointed by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. A statement showing suggestions made by this Committee is placed on the Table of Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 10].

(b) The recommendations have yet to be considered by the Council.

Electrification of Stations

***831. Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 2118 on the 10th May, 1956 and state:

(a) the progress of work up-to-date to electrify the nine stations between Howrah and Kharagpur in South Eastern Railway;

(b) whether the wiring programme will be completed by 1956-57 as scheduled;

(c) whether the electric grid of West Bengal is passing through Machada or Panchkura; and

(d) if so, when?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawaz Khan): (a) and (b). Arrangements are being made to take up the work shortly and the wiring is expected to be completed by 1956-57.

(c) It would pass through Machada and the information is it would also pass through Panchkura is being collected.

(d) Within about a year.

Agreement on Air Communications

***832. Shri Radha Raman:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose entering into Agreements regarding air communications with other countries as they did recently with Thailand; and

(b) if so, the names of those countries?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) and (b). A draft Air Agreement with the Government of Thailand for operating an Indian Air service to and through Thailand was initialled as far back as 1952 and a formal agreement was signed recently. Our negotiations with other countries have nor yet been finalised; hence it would be premature to say with which new countries we shall enter into air agreements.

Sugar Mills

***833. Shri B. D. Pande:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Indian Sugar Mills Association of Calcutta has sent a memorandum to him to the effect that the capacity of the existing sugar factories be reassessed before licensing new units to achieve the target of Five Year Plan period;

(b) the action Government have taken on this memorandum; and

(c) the number of sugar mills and how many have been ordered to be opened now on co-operative basis or otherwise?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes, sir.

(b) and (c). A statement is placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 11]

Nuclear Tests

***834. { Dr. Rama Rao:**
Shri Mohana Rao:

Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) whether he has received any communication from the National Union of Seafarers of India (Bombay) urging immediate steps to stop recruitment of Indian Seamen for ships which pass through regions where Hydrogen Bomb tests have been or are to be carried out;

(b) whether Government have made any representation to the U. K. Government about the possible ill-effects on 89 Indian Seamen engaged by the British Transport Ministry for a ship going to Christmas Islands near which Hydrogen Bomb test were and are to be carried out; and

(c) whether it is a fact that non-British Crew are not provided with protective apparel?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) Yes.

(b) No representation has been made to the U. K. Government in this regard. The matter was, however, taken up with the owners of the vessel in question who have stated that to the best of their knowledge here is no risk attached to the crew on the vessel's present voyage as she would be far away performing her return journey by the time any test is carried out.

(c) Government have no information on the point. Effort is being made to get information from the U. K. and Australia as to the practice followed by the Governments and shipowners there to protect their seamen against radioactive fall-outs.

Agricultural Loan for Manipur

***835. Shri Rishang Keishing:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any amount has been sanctioned by Government as agricultural loans for the State of Manipur for the current financial year;

(b) if so, the steps taken by Government for the full and proper utilisation of the amount for the benefit of both the hill and plain people; and

(c) if not the reasons why no amount has been provided as agriculture loan in the current Year?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes; Rupees one lakh.

(b) One hundred and fifty loan applications both from persons living in hills and plains are under enquiry by the State Government.

(c) Does not arise.

Stud Bulls

*836. **Shri L. M. Trivedi:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state :

(a) what is the number of stud bulls used in India; and

(b) what arrangements have been made to make these available to the villages?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) According to the Livestock census 1951 the number of stud bulls in India is 9·6 lakhs.

(b) This is the responsibility of State Governments.

Railway Mail Service Staff

*838. **Shri Kamath:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Railway Mail Service staff are denied Sunday off and even gazetted holidays; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram:) (a) R. M. S. Employees consist of staff in Travelling Sections in Mail offices and in Administrative offices. The Staff in travelling Sections alone do not get offs on Sundays or other gazetted holidays.

(b) Because they get offs during the cycles of their normal duty.

Health Laboratories

*839. **Shri M. Islamuddin:** Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1865 on the 2nd May, 1956 and state whether the details of the Schemes for the establishment of one principal laboratory at the headquarters of each State Government have been finalised?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar): The details have not yet been finalised.

Schistosomiasis

*840. **Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have any data on the occurrence and incidence of Schistosomiasis in India;

(b) if so, what is the data; and

(c) the measures Government propose to take to curb this disease?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar): (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). A statement containing the requisite information is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 12.]

Agricultural Indebtedness in Travancore-Cochin State

*841. **Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of agricultural indebtedness of peasants in Travancore-Cochin State at present;

(b) whether Government have any schemes on hand to relieve peasants from their debts; and

(c) if answer to (b) be in the affirmative, the nature and details?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) The particulars are not available.

(b) Yes.

(c) Loans are advanced for G.M.F Schemes and short, medium and long term loans are issued by Agricultural Co-operative Societies and Land Mortgage Banks.

Metric System

*842. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 495 on the 6th March, 1956 and state:

(a) whether the *ad hoc* Committee appointed for the introduction of the Metric System on Railways has submitted its report;

(b) if so, what the main recommendations are; and

(c) whether these have been accepted by Government?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) Not yet.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

इम्फाल और दीमापुर के बीच विमान सेवा

*८४३. **श्री रघुनाथ सिंह :** क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि

क्या यह सच है कि नागा विद्रोहियों की गतिविधियों के कारण इम्फाल और दीमापुर के बीच विमान सेवा बन्द करदी गयी है ?

संचार मंत्री (श्री जगजीवन राम) : संभवत: माननीय सदस्य इम्फाल और दीमापुर (दीनापुर नहीं) के बीच विमान-सेवा का उल्लेख कर रहे हैं। नागा विद्रोहियो की क्रियाशीलता के कारण इम्फाल और दीमापुर के बीच असूचित विमान-सेवा को स्थगित नहीं किया गया । विपरीत मौसम होने के कारण कुछ उड़ानों को रद्द कर देना पड़ा था ।

Survey of River Catchment Areas

***844. Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the two schemes of soil conservation in the Teesta Catchment areas and the survey of the river catchment areas in Darjeeling have been completed with the Central loan assistance;

(b) if not, how far they have progressed; and

(c) when they are expected to be completed?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 13].

Health Inspection of School Children

***845. Shri Radha Raman:** Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have sanctioned some amount for carrying out a programme of health inspection of school children in various States and their free feeding;

(b) if so, what is the amount and how it is proposed to be spent and when actually this scheme will be introduced;

(c) whether the States will be asked to augment the amount sanctioned by contributed sums from their own funds; and

(d) if not, why not?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar): (a) to (d). A Scheme for a School Health Service and a School Feeding Programme is under consideration.

Meteorological Assistance to Nepal

***846. Shri D. C. Sharma:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) the amount of equipment sent and the number of officers loaned by the Government of India to Nepal for providing facilities for the establishment of meteorological institutions and aviation centres;

(b) whether this aid has been given under the Colombo Plan or otherwise; and

(c) the conditions of service of the officers so loaned to Nepal?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) I lay on the Table of the Lok Sabha a statement regarding equipment supplied and staff posted at Kathmandu aerodrome in connection with the establishment of an Aeronautical Communication station there [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 14]. The equipment continues to be the property of the Civil Aviation Department of India and the staff is also under its technical and administrative control and their services have not been loaned to the Nepal Government.

(b) The aid has not been given under Colombo Plan but has been provided by mutual arrangement between the Governments of India and Nepal.

(c) Does not arise as the services of the staff have not been loaned to the Government of Nepal.

Inland Water Transport in Travancore-Cochin State

***847. Shri Achuthan:** Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) the Schemes submitted by the Travancore-Cochin State to the Central Government to develop the inland water transport during the Second Five Year Plan;

(b) the cost of the whole Schemes and the amount and Schemes sanctioned; and

(c) which are the Schemes to be taken up this year?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 15].

(c) The Alleppey-Shertallai canal.

Jullundur-Ferozepur Road

444. **Shri Ram Krishan:** Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the survey of Jullundur-Ferozepur Road has been completed;

(b) if so, the details of the survey report and names of the villages through which the road will pass; and

(c) when the actual construction will start?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 16].

Seed Testing Stations

445. **Shri Ram Krishan:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the scheme for the establishment of seed testing stations during the Second Five Year Plan period has been finalised;

(b) if so, the number of such stations state wise to be set up; and

(c) other features of the scheme?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) to (c). Yes. The scheme for establishing a Central Seed Testing Station for vegetable seeds has been finalised. Seed testing stations are proposed to be established in eleven States *viz.*, (1) U. P. (2) Bihar (3) West Bengal (4) Punjab (5) Madhya Pradesh (6) Bombay (7) Madras (8) Andhra (9) Jammu and Kashmir (10) Mysore and (11) PEPSU.

The services of the Central Seed Testing Station will be available to all the States in India. The State Deptts. of Agriculture will draw samples from stocks of vegetable seed producers and stockists and forward them to the Central Testing Station for testing. Reports on the samples will be sent to the respective State Deptts. who will issue appropriate certificates of purity. The seed testing in the initial stages will be voluntary, but all seed material intended to be tested shall have to be channelled through the respective State Deptts. of Agriculture. Samples of seed received from the State Deptts. will be examined at the Testing Laboratory with reference to:—(i) purity of type, (ii) freedom from seedborne disease, (iii) freedom from contamination with weed or other seeds, (iv) germination capacity and (v) moisture content. International standards, with suitable modifications, necessary for indigenous vegetables will be adopted for grading the quality. The main features of this Scheme under which seed testing stations are to be established in these States are two-fold *viz.*

(1) To organise an efficient Inspection Service for inspecting Standing crops at different stages of growth to ensure that the crops are true to the varieties grown and are free from admixtures and obnoxious weeds etc., and

(2) To report on the purity germination capacity and moisture percentage etc. of the seed samples tested.

New Telephone Exchanges

446. **Shri Bheekha Bhai:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state the number of Telephone Exchanges proposed to be opened during 1956-57 in different States, State-wise?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): The particulars are laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 17].

उदयपुर स्टेशन

४४७. **श्री बलवन्त सिंह मेहता :** क्या **रेलवे** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि उदयपुर जैसे पर्यटन-केन्द्र के स्टेशन पर यात्रियों के बैठने के लिये प्लेटफार्म पर एक भी बैंच नहीं है ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या सरकार यात्रियों को बैठने की सुविधा देने के लिये कुछ बैंचों की व्यवस्था करना चाहती है ?

रेलवे तथा परिवहन उपमंत्री श्री अलगेसन : (क) तथा (ख) । उदयपुर स्टेशन के प्लेटफार्म पर दो और मुसाफिरखाने में तीन बैंचें है ?

एक निर्धारित कार्यक्रम के आधार पर पश्चिम रेलवे के उदयपुर और दूसरे स्टेशनों पर अधिक बैंचों की व्यवस्था की जा रही है ।

Overbridge in Narsinghpur

448. **Shri Kamath:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any representation has been received urging the construction of an overbridge at the level crossing just on the outskirts of Narsinghpur town (Hoshangabad District Madhya Pradesh); and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). No such representation has been received. This level crossing, however, appears in the list of level crossings recommended by the State Government for replacement by over/under bridges but with a low priority. The State Government have been asked if they would like any of these works to be taken up and their reply is awaited.

Labour Disputes (Tripura)

449. **Shri Biren Dutt:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of disputes conciliated by the Labour Officer in Tripura during March 1955 to July, 1956;

(b) what are the types of disputes; and

(c) how many cases have been referred to Tribunal in Tripura during the same period?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): (a) to (c). The particulars are being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

Narmada Bridge

450. **Shri Kamath:** Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to refer to his answer to Starred Question No. 1715 and to supplementaries raised thereon on the 24th April 1956, and state at what stage the matter of construction of the bridge on the river Narmada at Hoshangabad rests?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): The State Government have completed the detailed survey and have asked the Government of India to supply them with the design for the bridge on the basis of the survey data. The design is under preparation and is expected to be completed shortly when it will be sent to the State Government for the preparation of detailed estimates.

Public Telephones at Stations

451. **Shri Kamath:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether public telephones have been installed at Pipariya, Gadarwara, Kareli and Narsinghpur Railway Stations on the Central Railway; and

(b) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). Public Telephones have been provided at Pipariya and Gadarwara. There are no public exchanges at Kareli and Narsinghpur and hence no public telephones have been installed at these Stations at present. However a public exchange is being provided at Narsinghpur station and when this is ready a telephone will also be provided at the station.

Wagons

452. **Shri Feroze Gandhi:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) the cost of a Broad Gauge wagon (22 tons capacity) manufactured in India;

(b) the cost of a Metre Gauge wagon (15 tons capacity) manufactured in India; and

(c) the names of the firms manufacturing goods wagons in India?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 18].

P & T. Office at Moovatupuzha

453. **Shri Mathew:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is proposed to construct a permanent Post and Telegraph Office building at Moovatupuzha in Travancore-Cochin State in response to representation received from the public;

(b) whether the site for the same is at the disposal of Government; and

(c) when the building may be expected to be ready?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) to (c). The expansion of the Post Office building at Moovatuphuzha has been under examination. An estimate for the purpose is being prepared after which its sanction will be taken up. A site for the purpose is available.

Public Telephone Office, Ayirure South

454. **Shri Mathew:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state

(a) whether the opening of a Public Telephone Office at Ayirure South in Travancore-Cochin has been under examination for several months now; and

(b) what decision has been taken in the matter?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) and (b). Yes; the matter is still under consideration.

Agricultural Credit Societies

455. **Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Primary Agricultural Credit Societies opened newly in the vairous States in accordance with the recommendations of All India Rural Credit Survey Report;

(b) the number of those which have been reorganised by amalgamating the existing Societies;

(c) whether the States have drawn any phased programme in this respect; and

(d) if so, the important features of the programme?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) to (d). A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 19].

Indian Coal Statistics

456. **Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) when the India Coal Statistics for 1955 will be published;

(b) the reasons for the delay; and

(c) the steps taken to expedite the publication?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): (a) Efforts are being made to publish the Statistics by the end of December 1956.

(b) The main reason for delay in publishing the Statistics is non-receipt of returns from the mine-owners in time. The returns which are received need careful scrutiny as they sometimes contain incorrect information. Considerable time is taken to get the returns corrected. Printing also takes about 4 to 5 months.

(c) Prosecutions have been instituted against the managements of mines who have persistently failed to submit annual returns. Statistics based on materials available are being compiled. Steps will also be taken to reduce the time taken in printing of the publication.

काम दिलाऊ दफ्तर

४५७. **श्री भक्त दर्शन** : क्या श्रम मंत्री निम्नलिखित आशय का एक विवरण सभा पटल पर रखने की कृपा करेंगे :

(क) भारत में इस समय जो काम दिलाऊ दफ्तर हैं, वे किन-किन स्थानों पर स्थित हैं ; और

(ख) दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना की अवधि में जो १२५ नये काम दिलाऊ दफ्तर खोलने की योजना स्वीकार की गई है, उन्हें किन-किन स्थानों पर खोलने का निश्चय किया गया है ?

श्रम उपमंत्री (श्री आबिद अली) : (क) सम्बन्धित विवरण सभा पटल पर रख दिया गया है [देखिये परिशिष्ट ५, अनुबन्ध संख्या २०]।

(ख) इस बारे में अभी तक फैसला नहीं हुआ है ।

Extra Departmental Post Offices

458. **Pandit D. N. Tiwary:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 282 on 5th December, 1955 and state:

(a) number of Extra Departmental Post Offices which are running at profit upto 31st March, 1956;

(b) amount of profit earned by Extra Departmental Post Offices in 1955-56; and

(c) number of Extra Departmenta Post Offices taken over by the department (State-wise) during 1955-56?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) to (c). Information regarding experimental extra departmental offices is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Sabha. Similar figures in respect of extra departmental offices which have already beeen made permanent are not maintained.

Matriculates as Peons

459. **Pandit D. N. Tiwary:**
Shri Bibhuti Mishra:

Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of matriculates serving as peons, orderlies and Khalasis in various zones either temporarily or permanently;

(b) the number amongst them taken as brake-men, record lifters, and couriors within the last one year;

(c) the number of new non-matriculates taken as brake-men, record lifters and couriors within the same period; and

(d) the reasons for not giving preference to those matriculates who are serving as peons etc.?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) 3,897.

(b) 39.

(c) 53.

(d) For none of these categories Matriculation qualification is necessary.

Khadi

460. **Shri Madiah Gowda**: Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) the quantity and the value of Khadi purchased by each of the Railways for 1954-55 and 1955-56;

(b) the purposes for which it is purchased; and

(c) the quantity and the value of non-khadi cloth purchased during those years and for what purpose?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 21].

Halt at Kuchaikot Station

461. **Shri Jhulan Sinha**: Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 328 on the 1st December, 1955 and state whether any decison has been taken with regard to the question of opening a "Halt" at Kuchaikot between the stations of Jalalpur and Sasamusa on the Sarvan-Gorakhpur loop line (N.E.R.)?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): Yes. It has been decided to open a Contractor-operated halt at Kuchaikot.

Wastage of Horticultural Products

462. **Shri Jhulan Sinha**: Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to the very heavy wastage amounting to approximately 15 to 20 per cent of the total horticultural products of the country for want of adequate provision for preservation, storage and transport thereof; and

(b) if so, whether Government contemplate taking suitable steps to reduce the wastage to the minimum extent possible?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) In order to minimise wastage schemes aiming at encouragement of preservation of fruits and vegetables and establishment of cold storages are under consideration. As regards transport, ventilated railway wagons are being progressivley introduced and this should also help.

Family Planning Centres

463. **Dr. Satyawadi**: Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to state:

(a) the details of work done at the different Family Planning Centres in New Delhi during 1955-56; and

(b) the amount spent at each of these Centres during that period?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar): (a) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 22].

(b) The total expenditure on these Centres during 1955-56 was Rs. 59,860/-. Separate figures for each Centre are not available.

Employment Exchange, Hyderabad

464. **Shri Krishnacharya Joshi**: Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) total number of persons registered for employment in the regional Employment Exchange at Hyderabad during 1955-56;

(b) the total number of persons absorbed during the same period; and

(c) the total amount sanctioned by Government towards contribution to maintain that office during the same period?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): (a) 49,255.

(b) 5,501.

(c) Rs. 20,976 during the year 1955-56.

Waste-lands in Travancore-Cochin State

465. **Shri A. K. Gopalan**: Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) the total area of waste-lands talukwise in Travancore-Cochin State;

(b) whether the Government have any schemes to utilise these lands in the Second Plan period; and

(c) if answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, the details thereof?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) A statement showing the area under culturable waste and area not available for cultivation, talukwise, in Travancore-Cochin State is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 23].

(b) Yes.

(c) These schemes relate to:—

(1) Development of cashewnut farming;

(2) Arecanut farming and research; and

(3) Colonisation and housing.

Relief to P. & T. Employees

466. Sardar Iqbal Singh: Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any financial aid has been sanctioned for the flood affected personnel of the P. &. T. Department in Punjab and PEPSU recently; and

(b) if so, the nature of help, and the persons covered by the same?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

चीनी मिल

४६७. श्री रा० न० सिंह : क्या कृषि मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) कितने चीनी मिलों के अपने निजी कृषि फार्म हैं, और वे फार्म कितने कितने एकड़ के हैं ; और

(ख) इन फार्मों में क्या क्या फसलें बोई जाती है और उनकी प्रत्येक एकड़ उपज कितनी है ?

खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री (श्री अ० प्र० जैन): (क) तथा (ख). सभा की टेबल पर एक विवरण रख दिया गया है । [देखिये परिशिष्ट ५, अनुबन्ध सं० २४] ।

कानपुर में रेल दुर्घटना

४६८. श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : क्या रेलवे मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि कानपुर सेंट्रल स्टेशन पर १९ जून, १९५६ की रात को फैजाबाद आने वाली सवारी गाड़ी के ६ डिब्बे टूट गये और इंजन पटरी से उतर गया ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो दुर्घटना के कारण क्या हैं ?

रेलवे तथा परिवहन उपमंत्री (श्री अलगेशन) : (क) सवाल में जिस दुर्घटना का जिक्र किया गया है, कानपुर स्टेशन पर १९-६-१९५६ को इस तरह की कोई दुर्घटना नहीं हुई ।

लेकिन १९-६-१९५६ को रात में लगभग २ बज कर ३५ मिनट पर, जब ३५४ डाउन दिल्ली-फैजाबाद सवारी गाड़ी उत्तर रेलवे के कानपुर स्टेशन की नं० २ लाइन में दाखिल हो रही थी, उसका इंजन पानी लेने के बम्बे से टकरा गया जिसकी वजह से पानी का बम्बा उखड़ गया और इंजन कैब और चार बोगियों को क्षति पहुंची ।

(ख) प्रत्यक्ष रूप से दुर्घटना का कारण यह है कि एक शंटिंग पाइलट के चालक-वर्ग ने बम्बे से पानी लेने के बाद उसे अपनी जगह पर नहीं लौटाया ।

Light-Houses

469. Sardar Iqbal Singh: Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) the progress made in the improvement and development of light-houses in the country during First Five Year Plan;

(b) the amount sanctioned for this purpose during the same period;

(c) the amount spent, out of this sum;

(d) the total value of the light-house equipment for which orders have been placed abroad; and

(e) time by which the equipment is expected to arrive?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) The progress made in the implementation of the development plans of the First Five Year Plan is as follows :—

(i) 35 new lights have been erected.

(ii) One second-hand ship for use as lighthouse tender and two new motor launches have been purchased.

(iii) Construction of four new lighthouse towers is in progress.

(iv) New Optical equipment and machinery have been imported from abroad for five lighthouses.

(v) Model studies and preliminary investigations at site were completed for the construction of a new lighthouse on a submarine site at Lushington Shoals in the Gulf of Kutch.

(vi) Fabrication of 22 new buoys and construction of a new motor launch are in progress.

(b) Rs. 200 lakhs.

(c) Rs. 44,41,600.

(d) Rs. 21 lakhs approximately.

(e) February 1957.

Telephone Information Service

470. **Sardar Iqbal Singh** : Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 272 on the 27th February, 1956 and state at what stage the matter stands regarding the scheme for starting an Information Service in the telephone exchanges?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram) : Details are being worked out for the same.

Road Construction in Punjab and PEPSU

471. **Sardar Iqbal Sngh** : Will the Minister of **Transort** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of bridges to be constructed on National Highways during the Second Five Year Plan in the Punjab and PEPSU;

(b) the names of the roads to be constructed in these States year-wise; and

(c) the total cost for each?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) to (c). Two statements giving the required information are laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 25].

Planting of Trees on National Highways

472. **Sardar Iqbal Singh** : Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state :

(a) the progress made so far in regard to planting of new trees on the National Highways; and

(b) also the progress made so far about planting of shrubs and flowers near major bridges?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan) : (a) and (b). Information as to the progress so far made in regard to the planting of new trees and growing shrubs and flowers near big bridges is not readily available, as progress reports in these matters are not received. Also the cost of these items is debited to maintenance and separate accounts are not kept.

B.C.G. Vaccination

473. **Sardar Iqbal Singh** : Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of persons who have been vaccinated with B. C. G. so far, State-wise and year-wise; and

(b) the amount spent so far by Central and States Governments on B.C.G. vaccinations State-wise and year-wise?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar) : (a) and (b) Two statements showing the number of persons B. C. G. vaccinated so far and the amount of expenditure incurred on the B. C. G. vaccination campaign are laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 26].

Tube-Wells in Punjab and PEPSU

474. { **Sardar Iqbal Singh**:
Sardar Akarpuri:

Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) the progress made with regard to the experimental tube-wells in Punjab and PEPSU;

(b) whether Government propose to go ahead with these projects; and

(c) if so, the target date set for its completion?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) The reference is presumably to the construction of experimental tubewells under the Groundwater Exploration Project. The field work under this Project has not yet started in Punjab and PEPSU.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) The work under this project is expected to be completed by the end of 1958.

"Own Your Own Telephone"

475. **Sardar Iqbal Singh:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of applicants under the "Own Your Own Telephone" scheme still awaiting connection in Delhi; and

(b) how long they have been waiting?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) 346.

(b) 43 applicants are pending from 1954 and the rest from thereafter.

Aerodrome at Tulihal

476. { **Shri S. C. Samanta:**
Shri Raghunath Singh:

Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is a proposal to construct an aerodrome at Tulihal which will be permanent and all-weather;

(b) if so, how the present aerodrome at Koiranghe four miles away from Manipur Capital will be utilised;

(c) what would be the estimate of expenditure for the new aerodrome; and

(d) what other facilities will be available at the new aerodrome?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) I lay on the Table of the Lok Sabha a statement giving the requisite information. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 27].

(c) Rs. 13·25 lakhs.

(d) Apart from a pucca runway, taxi-track etc., all facilities required for scheduled services will be provided at Tulihal.

Training in Malariology

477. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of persons who have so far been trained in malariology in India;

(b) how long the research work on the fundamentals of Malaria was carried out at the Malaria Institute of India, Delhi;

(c) how the malaria control programme during the First Five Year Plan worked; and

(d) the approximate time by which India can be made free of Malaria?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar): (a)—

Malaria Medical Officers .	1,351
Engineers . . .	249
Inspectors . . .	851.

(b) The research on the fundamentals of Malaria was started by the Central Malaria Bureau which was founded at Kasauli in 1909 under the direction of Dr. S. R. Christophers, a member of the Malaria Commission of the Royal Society. During the Great War 1914-18, the organisation got a set-back due to shortage of research workers. After the cessation of hostilities, Dr. Christophers returned to the Central Malaria Bureau and resumed intensive research work. In 1927, at the suggestion of Dr. Christophers, a permanent Central Organisation, under the designation 'Malaria Survey of India' was established in Delhi to carry out continuous and adequate investigation in regard to the prevention of Malaria in India. The name of this organization was changed to 'Malaria Institute of India' in 1937. The Institute is carrying on with the researches since its inception.

(c) During the First Five Year Plan period, the National Malaria Control Programme has succeeded in reducing the incidence of Malaria in the country to a considerable extent. According to data received from 16 States, Malaria incidence has gone down by 37 lakhs cases from 1953-54 to 1954-55, and during 1953-54, 1954-55 and 1955-56 (upto December, 1955) about 530 lakhs, 768 lakhs and 1,050 lakhs people respectively, were protected from Malaria.

(d) The National Malaria Control Programme is to bring Malaria under control. No definite time can be indicated at this stage regarding its eradication.

Drinking Water Facilities on Railways

478. **Shri Bheeka Bhai:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have received suggestions for providing drinking water facilities in the upper classes of Frontier Mail, Punjab Mail and other fast-going trains; and

(b) if so, whether Government have examined the suggestions and with what results?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). A suggestion to have water pots in the upper class compartments of the Frontier Mail was made at the meeting of the Western Railways' Zonal Railway Users' Consultative Committee on 14-4-56. But it was not accepted by the Committee as they are liable to breakage during the run and to dirty the compartments.

No suggestion has been received for provision of such facilities on other trains.

Indian Telephone Industries

479. **Shri Thimmaiah:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there is no proposal to increase the production in the Indian Telephone Industry, Bangalore under the Five Year Plan; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) No, Sir, the production will be increased during the Second Plan period.

(b) Does not arise.

P.& T. Staff Departmental Selection

480. **Shri Veeraswamy:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there was a selection of Departmental candidates for appointment as Inspectors of Post Offices recently in Madras circle;

(b) if so, how many have been selected in that circle; and

(c) how many belong to the Scheduled Castes out of the selected ones?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) Yes.

(b) Seventeen.

(c) Two.

Recruitment of Clerks and Postmen

481. **Shri Debendra Nath Sarma:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of candidates appointed as clerks, telephone operators and postmen in Assam in 1953-54, 1954-55 and 1955-56;

(b) the number among them who has from that State; and

(c) the number among them who belong to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes of that State?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) to (c). A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha. [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 28].

Out-Agencies

482. **Shri Veeraswamy:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Out-Agencies and Chief Agencies to sell tickets on each Railway;

(b) the amount of commission paid by each Railway to the Agencies in the years 1954-55 and 1955-56; and

(c) the advantages accruing from the Agency system to the Railways?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). A statement giving the required infomation is laid on the Table of the House [*See* Appendix V, annexure No. 29].

(c) It is economical to work on an agency system.

Udaipur-Chittorgarh Train Service

483. **Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the composition of bogies in the trains running from Udaipur to Chittorgarh and *vice versa* is the same as was ten years back;

(b) whether Government propose to increase the number of bogies to be attached in these trains to avoid congestion in view of increased passenger traffic in these years; and

(c) if so, the number of additional bogies that will be attached and when?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) Information regarding the number of bogie coaches on the trains running on the Udaipur-Chittorgarh section prior to 6-11-51 is not available as the section was then worked by *ex*-Rajasthan Railway. When on 6-11-51, this section was merged with the Western Railway, the number of coaches per train varied from an equivalent of 5 to 5 1/2 bogies. From 1-10-53 the load of one of the train services (both up and down) was increased by two bogies and subsequently from 16-4-56 by another four-wheeler.

(b) and (c). It is proposed to further increase the loads of trains Nos. 485 and 486 by one third class bogie coach, as soon as the requisite stock can be made available, having due regard to the extent of overcrowding prevailing over the various sections.

Tree Plantation in Tripura

484. **Shri Dasaratha Deb**: Will the Minister of **Food and Agriculture** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that tree plantation has been started by the Forest Department within locality of Selema Tripura;

(b) whether it is a fact that the people of those localities have been facing great difficulties in grazing their cows as the plantation has been started in a place surrounded by the villages;

(c) whether it is a fact that people of these localities have been fined very often by the Forest authorities on various pleas; and

(d) whether Government propose to abandon their plan to start plantation in a place or places surrounded by the villages?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes.

(b) No. The plantation covers only twenty-five acres and is about one half to one mile away from the nearest village. Cattle can graze easily in the extensive *khas* areas which are nearby.

(c) No. Only those persons who resort to unauthorised grazing in plantation areas are penalised if such a course becomes unavoidable in the public interest.

(d) Re-stocking of forests near villages is done in the public interest as it avoids the possibility of scarcity of firewood and housing materials etc., resulting mainly from 'Jhumming' operations.

Kamalpur-Ambasa Road in Tripura

485. **Shri Dasaratha Deb**: Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that compensation has not been paid to the affected persons whose land has been acquired by Government for the construction of Kamalpur-Ambasa Road in Tripura;

(b) if so, the reason for the delay; and

(c) when such compensation is expected to be given to the affected people?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha in due course.

Floods in Tripura

486. **Shri Dasaratha Deb**: Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any representation has been received claiming compensation for the damage of crops and paddy land due to opening diversion road near Dam Damia which has to be made due to breakage of bridge during the recent floods in Tripura on the road from Agartala to Sima; and

(b) if so, what steps have been taken so far to that effect?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha in due course.

Damage to Bridges in Tripura

488. **Shri Biren Dutt**: Will the Minister of **Transport** be pleased to state:

(a) how many bridges were damaged by the floods on 2nd June, 1956 in Tripura;

(b) how many of them have been rebuilt; and

(c) the amount spent on reconstruction of temporary bridges in the flood affected period in Tripura?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) Permanent/Semi-permanent bridges damaged: 23; Temporary bridges damaged: 15.

(b) none completely rebuilt but the bridges have been either repaired or diversions have been or are being provided.

(c) Temporary restoration work is estimated to cost about Rs. one lakh.

Rural Water Supply in Trichur District

489. **Shri Achuthan**: Will the Minister of **Health** be pleased to state:

(a) the schemes sanctioned to provide rural water supply in the Trichur District in Travancore-Cochin State and the cost per scheme;

(b) when will the scheme if any, to give good drinking water to the thickly populated North Western region of Parur Taluk (Vadakkekara and Chennamangalam Villages etc.) and to Vypean island in Cochin-Kanayanor Taluk, be taken up and completed; and

(c) whether Government are aware that for eight months in the year there is complete scarcity of good drinking water in the above region?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar): (a) The Vypeen project in Trichur District costing Rs. 64,946 to provide water supply and sanitation for 8 villages was sanctioned in the First Five Year Plan.

(b) and (c). The required information has been called for from the Government of Travancore-Cochin and will be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha when received.

Late running of Trains

490. **Shri Bogawat:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of trains (passengers as well as goods) running daily on Dhond-Manmad line;

(b) whether it is a fact that the passenger trains are alwsys late and delayed and the public have to suffer much thereby;

(c) the causes for the irregular service on this line; and

(d) what remedies Government are going to find for the same?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) A total of 6 up & down Passenger trains and a total of 13 up and down Goods ttains run on Dhond-Manmad line.

(b) The punctuality performance of passenger trains on the section has not been satisfactory.

(c) The causes are:—

- (i) Detentions for crossing of goods trains.
- (ii) Late starts from junction stations for connecting main line trains running late.
- (iii) Heavy loading and unloading of parcels traffic.
- (iv) Restriction of maximum speed of trains to 45 miles per hour on account of the condition of the track, allowing little margin for drivers for making up time.

(d) (i) Modification of the Time-table from 1-10-56 providing for adequate time for traffic requirements.

- (ii) Running of a Parcel train with the development of line capacity and availability of stock and locomotives.
- (iii) It is proposed to strengthen the track to permit of higher speeds.

Postmen at Basti

491. **Shri Dhulaya:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state :

(a) the number of postmen employed at Puranji Basti and Gandhigram (Basti) to deliver *dak* for the urban area;

(b) whether it is a fact that the postmen of those places generally deliver the letters etc. sufficiently late than usual hours due to heavy works; and

(c) if so, whether Government propose to increase their strength?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha.

Railway Saloons

492. **Shri K. K. Basu:** Will the Minister of **Railways** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Saloons in different Railways;

(b) how many of them are air conditioned;

(c) who are entitled to use them;

(d) the annual expenditure in maintaining them; and

(e) the return from such coaches annually?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) to (e). Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha.

Telephone Exchange in Vrindaban

493. **Shri Krishna Chandra:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) when the telephone exchange will be established at the pilgrim town of Vrindaban in Mathura District; and

(b) for how long this matter has been pending?

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) In about four months' time.

(b) About two years.

चितबड़ागांव स्टेशन

४९४. **श्री रा० न० सिंह :** क्या रेलवे मंत्री २५ जुलाई, १९५६ के अतारांकित प्रश्न संख्या १६३ के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार गाड़ियों को खड़ी करने के लिये चितबड़ागांव स्टेशन का विस्तार करना चाहती है;

(ख) क्या सरकार को पता है कि चितबड़ागांव स्टेशन इतना छोटा है कि माल लादने और सवारियों के लिये चौरी-चौरा स्टेशन पर जो सुविधायें हैं वे वहां पर नहीं हैं; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो यात्रियों और व्यापारियों को ये सुविधायें इस स्टेशन पर कब तक दी जायेंगी ?

रेलवे तथा परिवहन उपमंत्री (श्री अलगेशन) : (क) चितबड़ागांव में लूप लाइनों की लम्बाई बढ़ाकर २२५० फीट कर दी गयी हैं और माल-गोदाम में दी तरफ से जाने के लिए रास्ता बनाने का काम चालू है। इस समय स्टेशन के विस्तार की कोई दूसरी योजना नहीं है।

(ख) तथा (ग). सूचना मंगायी जा रही है और सभा-पटल पर रख दी जायेंगी।

DAILY DIGEST

[Tuesday, 7th August, 1956]

		COLUMNS
ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS		891—917
S.Q. No.	*Subject*	
784.	Ganga Bridge Project.	891—94
786.	Fertilizers and Chemicals Ltd., Alwaye	894—95
787.	Punctuality of Trains	895—96
789.	Fruit and Vegetable Development Board	896—97
790.	Sugar Cane.	897—900
792.	Food Production in the Second Plan Period	900—03
793.	Press Telegrams	903
794.	Princess and Victoria Docks, Bombay	903—04
795.	Indian Official's Death in Rome	904—05
796.	Agro-Economic Research Centres	905
797.	Turbo-Jet Aircrafts	906
799.	Indian Airlines Corporation	906—08
800.	Digboi Oil Company	908—10
801.	Homoeopathy	910—11
802.	Central Tobacco Research Institute	911—12
803.	Wheat	912
805.	Family Planning	913—14
806.	Transport Advisory Council	914
808.	Explosion in Noamandi	914—15
809.	Milk Production	915—16
810.	Departmental Catering	916—17
SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS—		
S.N.Q. No.		
7.	Leakage of Telegrams in Chandigarh	917
WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS		918—56
S.Q. No.		
785.	Howrah-Burdwan Main Line Electrification	918
788.	Hangars at Bamrauli Airport	918
791.	Dairy Research Institute, Bangalore	919
798.	Reserve stocks of Wheat in Delhi	919
804.	Posts and Telegraphs Service with the People's Republic of China	919
807.	Industrial Training Institute	920
811.	Chowkidars in Civil Aviation Department	920
812.	Kamalpur Airport	920—21

S.Q. No.	*Subject*	COLUMNS
813.	Editor, 'Kamgar'	921
814.	Training of Apprentices	921—22
815.	Price of Copra in Travancore-Cochin State.	922
816.	Mecheri-Mettur Railway Section	922—23
817.	Suspension of Transport System in Tripura	923
818.	American Team of Experts of Indian Railways.	923
819.	Railway Mail Service Staff	924
820.	Rise in prices in Assam	924
821.	Asia Pacific Forestry Commission	924
822.	Price of rice in Madras State	925
823.	Indo-Pak Agreement	925
824.	One-Man Tribunal	926
825.	Stoppage of Water Supply	926
826.	Kandla Port	926
827.	Snake-bite remedy	927
828.	Amalapuzhai-Shertallai Canal	927—28
829.	Air Routes to Far East.	928
830.	Agricultural Meteorology	928
831.	Electrification of Stations	928—29
832.	Agreement on Air Communications	929
833.	Sugar Mills	929
834.	Nuclear Tests	930
835.	Agricultural loan for Manipur	930—31
836.	Stud Bulls	931
838.	Railway Mail Service Staff	931
839.	Health Laboratories	931
840.	Schistosomiasis	931—32
841.	Agricultural Indebtedness in Travancore-Cochin State	932
842.	Metric System	932
843.	Air Service between Imphal and Dinapur	932—33
844.	Survey of River Catchment Areas	933
845.	Health Inspection of School Children	933
846.	Meteorological Assistance to Nepal	934
847.	Inland Water Transport in Travancore-Cochin State.	934

U.S.Q. No.	Subject	COLUMNS
444.	Jullundur-Ferozepur Road	935
445.	Seed Testing Stations	935—36
446.	New Telephone Exchanges	936
447.	Udaipur Station	936
448.	Overbridge in Narsinghpur	936—37
449.	Labour Disputes (Tripura)	937
450.	Narmada Bridge	937
451.	Public Telephones at Stations	937—38
452.	Wagons	938
453.	P. & T. Office at Moovatupuzha	938
454.	Public Telephone Office, Ayirure South	938
455.	Agricultural Credit Societies	939
456.	Indian Coal Statistics	939
457.	Employment Exchange Offices	939—40
458.	Extra Departmental Post Offices	940
459.	Matriculates as Peons	940—41
460.	Khadi	941
461.	Halt at Kuchaikot Station	941
462.	Wastage of Horticultural Products	941—42
463.	Family Planning Centres	942
464.	Employment Exchange, Hyderabad	942
465.	Waste-lands in Travancore-Cochin State	942—43
466.	Relief to P. & T. Employees	943
467.	Sugar Mills	943
468.	Railway Accident at Kanpur	944
469.	Light-Houses	944—45
470.	Telephone Information Service	945
471.	Road construction in Punjab and Pepsu	945—46
472.	Planting of Trees on National Highways	946
473.	B.C.G. Vaccination	946
474.	Tube-wells in Punjab and Pepsu	946—47
475.	"Own Your Own Telephone"	947
476.	Aerodrame at Tulihal	947
477.	Training in Malariology	948
478.	Drinking water facilities on Railways	948—49
479.	Indian Telephone Industries	949
480.	P. & T. Staff Departmental Selection	949
481.	Recruitment of Clerks and Postmen	949—50
482.	Out-Agencies	950
483.	Udaipur-Chittorgarh Train Service	950—51
484.	Tree Plantation in Tripura	951
485.	Kamalpur-Ambasa Road in Tripura	951
486.	Floods in Tripura	952
488.	Damage of Bridges in Tripura	952
489.	Rural Water Supply in Trichur District	952—53
490.	Late running of Trains	953
491.	Postmen at Basti	953—54
492.	Railway Saloons	954
493.	Telephone Exchange in Vrindaban	954
494.	Chit Baragaon Station	954—56

LOK SABHA DEBATES Dated.....12.3.2015

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

LOK SABHA

Tuesday, 7th August, 1956

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

12 NOON

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

INUTES (1955-56) VOL. 5, NOS. 4 and 5.

श्री ब० गो० महता (गोहिलवाड) : श्रीमान, मैं एस्टीमेटस समिति, १९५५-५६ की कार्यवाही-सारांश-खंड ५—अंक ४ तथा ५ को पेश करता हूं।

BIHAR AND WEST BENGAL (TRANSFER OF TERRITORIES) BILL

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): Sir, I beg to move that the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to provide for the transfer of certain territories from Bihar to West Bengal and for matters connected therewitb be extended upto the 10th August, 1956.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

> "That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to provide for the transfer of certain territories from Bihar to West Bengal and for matters connected therewith be extended upto the 10th August, 1956."

The motion was adopted.

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS BILL*

The Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the declaration of certain highways to be national highways and for matters connected therewith.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

> "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the declaration of certain highways to be national highways and for matters connected therewith."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I introduce the Bill.

STATES REORGANISATION BILL—Contd.

Clauses 2 to 15.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up futher clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill to provide for the

---

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II-Section 2, dated 7-8.56 pp. 655—564.

[Mr. Speaker]

reorganisation of the States of India and for matters connected therewith, as reported by the Joint Committee.

Yesterday, it was decided that the hon. Minister will reply to the debate on clauses 2 to 15 and also to the debate on clauses 16 to 49. I have received a few letters from some hon. Members, one from Shri Mukerjee and another from Shri Trivedi. The matter was also raised incidentally yesterday by Shri Chatterjee They want to raise a point of order as to the admissibility of certain amendments. After the reply to these clauses is over and when I come to these amendments one after another, I will certainly hear what all the hon. Members have to represent.

Now, I call upon the hon. Minister to reply.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): Sir, I am thankful to you and to the hon. Members of the House for having permitted me twice to defer my remarks on clauses 2 to 15. My task has since become easy and agreeable. Patience, according to a Hindi proverb, yields sweet fruits. So, I am here to express my gratitude to the hon. Members who have given a new turn to the debate on the States Reorganisation Bill.

As the hon. Members are aware at every stage of the discussion, Bombay has overshadowed the entire canvas here, whether we were discussing the report of the SRC or the motion for reference of the Bill to the Joint Committee; or, later thereafter, the Bill as amended by the Joint Committee along with the report of the Joint Committee; Bombay eclipsed everything else. The entire House seemed to be interested more in Bombay than in the rest of the country taken together. If we measure the importance of Bombay by the length of time that was bestowed on the consideration of this problem of Bombay, we will realise the significance and importance of this problem. Throughout it was a spontaneous effort. There was no desire on the part of anybody to create any difficulty but everyone felt as though he had intimate relationship with Bombay and as though he was himself a part of Bombay. That is how Bombay loomed large during these discussions and everything else was relegated to the background.

We, from the outset, tried to find a satisfactory solution. There seemed to be unanimity as to what would be the best and the ideal solution for the problem of Bombay and other matters connected with Bombay. The SRC recommended a bilingual State for Bombay and thereafter, the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee had itself suggested a bilingual State for Bombay including not only the territories mentioned in the proposal of the SRC but also Vidarbha. Gujarat also was throughout conscious of the fact that an abiding solution for the problem of Bombay and the neighbouring areas of Maharashtra and Gujarat could be found only in a big bilingual State. The Congress bas, especially after seeing the reactions to some of the proposals made in the SRC Report and the spirit of isolation, separatism, linguism, etc. that bad been generated, expressed an emphatic opinion that only large States, if possible of a composite character, could provide the necessary corrective to the existing state of mind and tendencies, as revealed in the discussions. The Congress passed a resolution at Amritsar to that effect. The Prime Minister had more than once stated in unequivocal language that he stood for a bilingual State of Bombay and, if possible, also for other places.

I had the privilege of speaking on this subject on several occasions.

Every time I laid emphasis on two points: (1) that the solution for Bombay could be found only in a bilingual State, and (2) that we are determined to find an agreed solution and that if we fail, it would not be a failure of Maharashtra or Gujerat but of all of us and much more of those who are in charge of the affairs in the Government than of those who are outside. So, so far as the desire, so for as the desideratum, was concerned, there was no anomaly, no difference of opinion and no attempt to create confusion.

But inspite of all this we did not succeed in devising a solution which would fulfil the conditions to which I have referred. We kept our mind open and throughout we were striving to find some solution which would be acceptable to Maharashtra and Gujerat, and to the country at large. Sometimes it seemed to be within grasp but again it eluded and we could not grapple with it. The affairs continued in that state. In this House too there was a feeling of some deficiency, of inadequacy, so far as the decision regarding Bombay was concerned. In the House, inspite of the efforts made by hon. Members to deal with the various controversial problems in a restrained manner, there seemed to be some tension which, somehow or other, did not allow people who were intimately concerned with this vital problem to come close to discuss the various pros and cons and to reach an agreed understanding. That was the state of affairs.

And we, on our part, when we ultimately decided that Bombay should be centrally administered and Gujerat and Maharashtra should be separate autonomous, States, still placed before us the objective of a bigger bilingual State consisting of Bombay, Maharashtra and Gujerat. We provided in the Bill that there would be a common High Court for Bombay, Gujerat and Maharashtra. We also suggested that, if possible, these three units should have a common Governor and also a common Public Service Commission. We had hoped that by maintaining these ties intact it might be possible later to bring these units closer and to revive the composite State of Bombay in a grander scale.

So, when the matter was discussed in this House and these clauses were under scrutiny, I was happy to find that an amendment to the effect that Maharashtra, Marathwada, Vidarbha, Gujarat, Saurashtra and Bombay should form a composite State. I am greatful to the Members who....

An hon. Member: And Kutch.

Pandit G. B. Pant: And Kutch also. Kutch, though least, is really an important unit and especially we, who are connected with its administration today, Kutch being centrally administered, have close ties with it. Besides, it had to undergo a grave natural calamity only recently. So we could not forget it. All these were to form one unit.

This amendment No. 462, which was proposed by a number of Independent Members headed by Shri Frank Anthony, and which was moved by Shri Frank Anthony and supported by Shri Tulsidas and others, opened the door which seemed to be half shut, if not banned altogether. It is a matter of gratification that they were able to support the amendment with an unanswerable and un-assailable argument. But it was not merely a matter of reasoning. It is not, in such cases, the arguement and the appeal to reason that by itself disarms opposition and wins over the waverer or the opponent. They placed the whole question before the Lok Sabha in an irresistible manner and they had the support of all sections of the House. The problem of Bombay had cut across all party affiliations. It was essentially a national problem and the solution that has been found for Bombay is essentially and truly national in every sense of the term. It is not a particular party which has devised this solution. (*An Hon. Member:* Question) It was put forward with great sincerity and with unmistakable and in every way a profound earnestness and faith in the adequacy of the proposal that was made by the movers, and still more by those who supported it. I am thankful to Shri Kripalani ji, to Shri

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

Asoka Mehta, to Shri C. D. Deshmukh and to other friends who extended their support to this amendment. Shri Jaipal Singh went to the length of saying that he would forego his own claims if Bombay is to become a big bilingual State. The national urge manifested itself in its intensity. The sentiments, which had been suppressed and which had been looking forward for a suitable opportunity for their manifestation, got an opportune moment for their expression and for their manifestation.

I wonder if anything like this would have been easily anticipated even a week before the day when the matter was taken up. This Parliament has many achievements to its credit but none, I submit, greater than this achievement of the acceptance by all, excepting a few, of this solution of a bilingual State consisting of Gujerat, Maharashtra and Bombay for the western region.

The Minister of Education and Natural Resources and Scientific Research (Maulana Azad): And Kutch.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Kutch. I regard Kutch as part of Saurashtra and it is because of the shadow under the lamp that I forget Kutch oftener than I ought to. But it was really an occasion when one felt elated. The Parliament proved worthy of its mettle. The Members of Parliament rose above narrow considerations and they demonstrated their unique capacity to handle big problems in a national way.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Had not the MPCC passed a resolution in similar terms in October? Why was it not accepted?

Pandit G. B. Pant: I think there was some irony and the time was not mature for it. I wish that it had been possible to reach a correct decision earlier, but we did not succeed in framing a scheme on the lines indicated in this manner. But better late than never. We were gradually approaching almost a state of emergency and on such an occasion, it is gratifying that the Parliament took the matter in its own hands and it impressed everyone with the necessity and desirability of having a solution of this type. So, when later we came to know of it more fully, we found that almost the whole House....

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Pandit G. B. Pant: ......excepting Members who in a suppressed voice say, 'No, No,' all others were for it.

Shri K. K. Basu: (Diamond Harbour): It was louder.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I know they can shout out to make up for the deficiency of their numbers. So, all others supported this scheme and this proposal. Yet, while the Members of Parliament prepared the way, they showed us the light at the time when we were surrounded with gloom and there was still another problem which had to be solved. All of us were in favour of it; if we had been free we would have accepted it long ago. But we had no intention, at any time, to impose anything on Maharashtra or Gujerat. So, it became necessary to consult the views and wishes of the leaders of Maharashtra, Gujerat and Bombay.

Armed with the unanimous support of the Members of Parliament, our task became relatively easy and we then explored these avenues which would ultimately lead to a final solution agreed and accepted not only by the Parliament but by everyone concerned. So, we discussed the matter with the leaders and the representatives of Maharashtra, of Gujerat and of Bombay.

Shri S. S. More: Belonging to the Congress only.

Shri G. B. Pant: No. Congressmen as well as non-Congress men..

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Pandit G. B. Pant: ....except perhaps those who would not have liked to join these talks. If there is any difficulty, I shall again go to Shri More's place and have a talk with him.

Shri S. S. More: This personal touch is not necessary here.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Then I will say, "to any Member's place".

I withdraw your name. I am not at all inclined to enter into any controversy on this happy occasion. I can only express my profound gratitude and my feelings of satisfaction and gratification. They are uppermost in my mind and nothing else counts. So, we succeeded in winning also their support and their consent for these proposals.

Thus, we have now a scheme which has been accepted and blessed by a large majority of the Members of Parliament, which has been accepted by Government and which has also the support of the four areas concerned.

An Hon. Member: Question.

Pandit G. B. Pant: These areas are Maharashtra, Gujerat, Bombay and Kutch.

Now, it is an occasion for felicitations. I congratulate the hon. Members of this House for finding a satisfactory, abiding and permanent solution for a vexed problem which had shaken all parts of the country, which had created very difficult situations, which had left a trial behind and which had proved to be almost incapable of a satisfactory solution. Thus, this House deserves the gratitude of everyone in this country and of those who are particularly in charge of the administration today. I hope that we will continue to face our national problems in this spirit.

Parties exist. But party affiliations are meant for normally petty, trivial matters. Where large questions of national policy are concerned, they do not admit of any difference of opinion on ideological or fundamental grounds, and it should be possible for us to reach agreed conclusions. So, I am happy that a decision has been reached. But let us also realise the responsibilities that we have undertaken and the responsibilities which flow from this decision. The hon. Members must be knowing that this State of Bombay with Maharashtra, Gujerat, Saurashtra and Kutch will have an area of about 2 lakhs square miles. It will have a population of nearly 50 million. As such, it will be bigger than many of the independent States in the West. The responsibilities that those who will be in charge of the administration will have to discharge, will be onerous. They will stand in need of assistance, of sympathy and of support from the Parliament. I think they will find encouragement in the idea that this solution had been found by the Parliament itself spontaneously. It will be a reassurance to them that the Parliament will keep a kindly and tender eye on their affairs. We, as Members responsible for this decision, will have to see to it that those who have to undertake the responsibility of implementing it get every support and every assistance from Parliament. Five or six units and areas are being connected together. They will all be bound by the invisible silken tie; care has to be taken to see that that bond does not snap, that it is enduring and that this solution works to the satisfaction of all and proves to be of a permanent character. There are murmurings heard here and there even now. I should say that it would be hardly fair—I would not say that it would be unpatriotic—for anyone to sabotage the decision which has been taken unanimously by this House.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East): No, no.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I think two words have provoked you—sabotage and unanimity—neither of which you like very much.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Then, it is not fair; there is no unanimity.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I think you will yourself indicate how many are against.

Shri Nambiar: We will have a division.

Pandit G. B. Pant: That is the role for which you always stand. You are provoked because this stands for unanimity. You will have division always; division on any decision.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: It is betrayal.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I was saying that all the various units have been bound by a silken tie and we must so handle and tender it that the bond gets strong. Those who may think of creating trouble must feel that when the solution has been so reached, no defiance will be permissible and no defiance will be helpful. Of course, the right of criticism in a democratic country is there, but anything more and beyond that when a national solution has been found by the national Parliament cannot be thought of. I trust that this arrangement will last; if anything tends to break it, it again becomes a vexed problem and these units will again create the same anguish, the same agony, which we had to undergo during the last many months. So, let us take care and see that nothing is said or done that would tend to weaken the bonds which had been there and which are now being extended a little further. Bombay has been a composite State and it is only the addition of Saurashtra and Vidarbha that is now being made. Otherwise, Bombay for decades has been the centre of national union and it will continue to be so. It will be a big maritime State which will guard our western frontiers adjoining the seas. It will be big and with its strength and its power, it will go a long way in safeguarding not only the security of the country, but also the rights and the privileges of social justice for which we all stand.

Bombay has been great not only commercially, culturally and industrially, but also in many other ways. We look to Bombay for guidance even today. The torch of nationalism was first lit in Bombay. It was passed on from one leader to another and Bombay has produced great intellectual giants, great patriots; and, how very wonderful will be the performance of this new State when we remember that Gandhi, Tilak, Gokhale Naoroji and Ranade belonged to Gujarat, Maharashtra and Bombay! With such a galaxy of great men, there will be continuous, unfailing and powerful inspiration for those who will have the privilege of living in this big State. I can only express the hope that the scheme as has now been finally accepted will now be worked in the best of spirits, in a cordial atmosphere and with a determination to make a complete success of it. Unfortunately, during the last few months, the atmosphere has been somewhat surcharged. It will perhaps take a little time for things to settle down to normal; but, we have turned round the corner. The trail has faded away and the memories of the tragic unfortunate happenings will have to be wiped out. We will have to settle down to a life of comradeship, fellowship and neighbourly friendliness.

Bombay has just recently, as you were told by our Prime Minister, succeeded in producing atomic energy. This scheme was accepted by the majority of the Members of the House almost on the day on which atomic energy was generated in Bombay. That augurs well for its success. So, let us look forward to a new era of hope, faith and co-operative endeavour. We have to apply ourselves to the constructive activities which alone can raise the stature of the common man in this country. The Five Year Plan is getting on us every day and the discussions on the reorganisation of States have at least to some extent come in the way of its rapid progress. We have to make good the deficiency. We have to see that the progress now is sufficiently quick and that we regain what we have lost in the course of the discussions during the last many months. I hope that this decision will not only help Bombay, will not only prove satisfactory in so many ways so far as these States are concerned, but also pave the way for greater understanding, for greater unity and for greater accommodation. These are what we badly need today.

There are other parts of the country where too there are small disputes which have not yet been resolved. In view of our success in this big affair, it is earnestly hoped that they too will now be settled amicably by the representatives of the States concerned. Let us at least look forward to the future with hope and we can trust that Providence will guide us, it will come to our aid, in all emergencies. There was benevolence, if not divinity, behind the solution that had been reached with regard to Bombay and we can hope that if we are faced with difficulties in future also, by common endeavour we shall be able to work and to get over them without leaving any trace of bitterness, recrimination or ill-will behind. When I was sitting yesterday in the Central Hall, I was repeatedly reminded of the three portraits which are there—Mahatma Gandhi and Lokamanya Tilak on one side and Dadabai Naoroji on the other--and I felt that Gujarat and Maharashtra have given us these three great sons of India. So, we will look to them, to this composite State which has carried the age old memories of these great patriots, for inspiration, for our guidance and for the progress and prosperity of the country.

Shri Kelappan (Ponnani): Sir, there is the possibility of forming another maritime multilingual State in the South the time is auspicious. Will the Prime Minister and the Home Minister explore the possibility......

Mr. Speaker: The Home Minister has something more to say.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I suggest that the principle of this amendment may be accepted. It may be necessary to give another amendment or to make some changes another day so that it may fulfil the purpose which my friend has in view. So, while reserving the right to propose an alternative draft which will carry out these very principles and will be based on them, I submit that the principle of this amendment be accepted.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): How can that be accepted?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Home Minister is replying in general terms to the debate on clauses 2 to 15.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): It has no reference to the Boundary Commission at all.

Mr. Speaker: The Boundary Commission comes up in relation to clauses 16 to 49.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: No.

Mr. Speaker: This is the most important point. I will ask him to reply to the other points that have been raised. Some other points have been raised, regarding the Boundary Commission. But, first of all, let us dispose of this matter regarding Bombay. That is the most contentious one. Others are also equally contentious in the opinion of members. So far as this is concerned, the hon. Home Minister has replied. Let me hear if there is any objection. First of all, let us take the amendments. What is the objection to this amendment? If three or four members want to speak, they may agree among themselves as to who will be their spokesman.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): The amendment has not been moved.

Mr. Speaker: I find that there are three amendments, 428, 462 and 512. All of them have been moved.

Shri Tulsidas (Mehsana West): Regarding amendment No. 462, may I point out that there has been a certain corrigendum attached to this

[Shri Tulsidas]

report that certain territories were not included? Therefore, we have moved an amendment to that amendment, amendment No. 509 to amendment No. 462. It will complete the whole picture.

Mr. Speaker: I am coming to the amendment to the amendment. As far as I am able to gather, amendment No. 428 was moved by Mr. Trivedi and Babu Ramnarayan Singh. That relates to the formation of a State consisting the present State of Bombay minus those that have gone to Karnataka and the other States of Saurashtra and Maharashtra and also Vidarba etc. The principle is there.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Is it clause 9?

Mr. Speaker: We are on clause 8 relating to Bombay. Regarding amendment No. 462, it is the same as the above and the operative portions (which are excluded from Bombay therein) are included in Bombay. Amendment No. 512 puts it a little more in a legal form. Hon. Members may proceed with this more calmly and leisurely. Amendment No. 462 is sufficiently comprehensive so far as the territories are concerned; the operative portion is also there. Now, it may be put in somewhat better language and I find that amendment No. 512, which has been tabled, contains better language. If we accept the principle of amendment No. 462 or 482, consequential amendments will also have to be moved. Now let me hear the objections to the validity of these amendments. What is the objection? Who is going to speak first?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): My objection is on the point of order I was trying to raise yesterday to the amendments Nos. 462, 512 and 519. There may be one or two others also in the jumble which I have not been able to find out. I would press this point of order and deal with it with certain patience particularly because I am speaking in an atmosphere which is full of the somewhat high-flown and mellifluous oratory of the Home Minister. My submission to you....

Mr. Speaker: On a point of order all these observations need not be made.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: My point of order is that these amendments, and particularly amendment No. 462 to which the Home Minister has accorded his support is totally out of order and patently *ultra vires* of the Constitution. I say this because the Home Minister has said that on certain occasions Parliament can take things into its own hands. But I would like you to please remember that Parliament functions within the ambit of the Constitution and if there is something which is sought to be done, perhaps with the best of motives, which, however, goes against the provisions of the Constitution, then naturally that cannot be countenanced. Now, the requirements of the Constitution, as envisaged in article 3, are not only procedural but have great value from the point of view of substance and of democratic propriety. Now, such requirements cannot be waived either by the Chair or by a numerously signed memorandum from the Members of Parliament. My submission is that the amendments vitally extend the scope of the Bill and it is clear from article 3 that a condition precedent to the introduction of such a Bill is that its proposal or proposals should have been referred to the legislatures affected for ascertaining their views.

Article 3 reads as follows:

"Parliament may by law—

(a) form a new State by separation of territory from any State or by uniting two or more States or parts of States or by uniting any territory to a part of any state;

(b) increase the area of any State;

(c) diminish the area of any State;

(d) alter the boundaries of any State;

(e) alter the name of any State:

Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliament except on the recommendation of the President and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the area, boundaries or name of any of the States specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule, the Bill has been referred by the President to the Legislature of that State for expressing its views thereon within such period as may be specified in the reference or within such further period as the President may allow and the period so specified or allowed has expired."

By "proposals" I suggest it is meant not ideas floating in the air and being discussed by certain people, but proposals actually incorporated in the Bill, and by the "expression of views" I mean not casually expressed views by certain Members in the course of discussion in a legislature, but views which have been ascertained as far as the proceedings of the relevant legislature can give us an indication of that. Therefore, I submit that the legislatures affected—and in this case there are four legislatures affected, Bombay, Hyderabad, Saurashtra and Madhya Pradesh—must have had an opportunity of directing their minds to a real consideration of the proposal or proposals. Whether a proposal is carried here in this Parliament or not is completely irrelevant when we bear in mind the provisions of the Constitution. I submit that this interpretation Is in conformity with all rules laid down by Maxwell and other authorities

I would like to draw your attention to a matter of very much lesser import where you yourself gave a ruling on 3rd September, 1953. On that occasion the Estate Duty Bill was under discussion and Government sought to introduce some additions. My friend, the ex-Minister of Finance was in charge of the Bill and he defended the proposition that the addition could be permitted. On that occasion you were pleased to point out that what the Government wanted to do was to extend the scope of the amendment, and even though you held that what the Government wanted to do was not inconsistent with the purpose of the Bill, you said—I am quoting from Parliamentary Debates of 3rd September, 1953:

> "True, it is not inconsistent. It is in the nature of things that it could be in the Bill. This is an Act of Parliament. All the same, technically I am afraid it is not within the scope of the Bill. I would suggest therefore that this rule may be suspended and if the hon. Minister makes a motion, then it is for the House to suspend the rule."

This is what you said in regard to that matter, but the question before us is very much more vital, it is very much more fundamental because there is a definite constitutional provision requiring that the proposals in regard to States reorganisation should be in a properly ascertainable form for the purposes of discussion in the relevant legislatures and in the affected legislatures there has to be discussion and the views of the affected legislatures have to be ascertained by the President. The recent constitutional amendment only removes the fetters in regard to the time-schedule, but as far as the obligation to secure the views of the affected States is concerned, the rights of the States are very much in the picture. Therefore, my submission is that it could never have been the intention of the Constitution that so vital a matter as the extension of States and large-scale modification of State boundaries and their amalgamation into a big unit could be decided without reference—specific and clear reference—to the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

States affected, in this instance Bombay, Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh and Saurashtra.

I remember that when the question of having an amalgamation of West Bengal and Bihar came into the picture, the States Reorganisation Bill was introduced in this House but on that occasion the Home Minister said in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that it was a matter which had to be part of another Bill. It could not be brought in because it required prior discussion and prior consultation of the legislatures concerned. Therefore, I feel that the amendments which I am impunging are of a radical nature. They seek to replace former proposals in the Bill. Neither in the States Reorganisation Report nor in the Bill as circulated by Government was there anything like the radical alteration of boundaries which is now sought to be put in by means of a stray suggestion which comes from certain Members of the House, worked up into a kind of artificial movement and then paraded by the Home Minister as a declaration of national determination. I feel that is not the way in which we should proceed. I submit that an entirely new set of proposals are being sought to be introduced into the Bill, and if we accept it, then that would be a process nugatory of the provisions of the Constitution. It would not be proper for 250 Members or even more......

Mr. Speaker: I have no intention of preventing any hon. Member from speaking when they feel so much. I would certainly give opportunity to hon. Members, but he should always bear in mind the scope of the discussion over a point of order. Let him raise it. He said it is *ultra vires* of the Constitution, that this is a fundamental matter and not merely a formal affair, that this ought to be sent to the various States for their views. Then he said that proposals meant not merely proposals but were as good as provisions. Also "views" according to him did not mean everything that is said but must be tantamount to a decision. I have noted these four or five points that have been raised by him. Then what more legal points has he to raise? Of Course, this is not a general discussion on the amendment. The amendment was moved, was discussed, everything is over. Therefore, let us stick strictly to the point. Any other point?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am making my last submission that the views of the Members of this House ascertained by a signature campaign or otherwise...

Mr. Speaker: All that is irrelevant on a point of order. All that need not be referred to. Let there be signatures, no signatures, I am not going to take notice of those signatures. The point is whether it is *ultra vires* or *intra vires*, whether the amendment ought not to be allowed and is inadmissible, if so on what grounds. He has nothing more to say?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If you do not want to hear me....

Mr. Speaker: I want to hear him at length but he must confine himself to the rules of procedure.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I told you in the beginning that I was following the hon. Home Minister. A technical, legal matter is to be discussed but it is in an atmosphere where certain other things have been injected, and that is why I have to point out that the technicality of the question I am raising is important from the point of view of democratic propriety and the fact that so many Members of this House have suddenly reached a new decision which may or may not be right has nothing to do with the rights and wrongs of this matter as far as the interpretation of the Constitution is concerned.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): The question that there has been a dramatic climax or a sudden somersault is absolutely irrelevant for the purpose of discussing the constitutional validity of this proposal.

You know, Sir, the fundamental principle is that an Act which is *ultra vires* cannot be ratified even if it is consented to by all the members of the corporation or by all the Members of Parliament. We are submitting that it is *ab initio ultra vires*. Therefore, it is void from the very inception.

Our Constitution has made a radical departure from the American Constitution and from the Australian Constitution. Under the American Constitution you have got to get the ratification of the legislatures of each of the States concerned. In the Australian Constitution you have got not only to get the ratification, but also to hold a referendum and get the approval of the majority of the electorate.

Now, our Constitution-makers have made a conscious departure. But they have said that Parliament shall get the legislative competence, provided two conditions precedent are fulfilled. My submission is this, namely that one of the vital conditions precedent, prescribed by our Constitution, is lacking here.

1 P.M.

Kindly look at the proviso to article 3. You know that Parliament amended the proviso the other day. Article 3 reads:

"Parliament may by law—

(a) form a new State by separation of territories from any State....

(b) increase the area of any State;

(c) diminish the area of any State;

(d) alter the boundaries of any State;

(e) alter the name of any State:

Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliament, except on the recommendation of the President, and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the area, boundaries or name of any of the States specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule, the Bill has been referred by the President to the Legislature of that State for expressing its views thereon within such period as may be specified in the reference....".

Therefore, the Constitution of India demands that before Parliament assumes legislative power, there must be a reference by the President to the Legislature of each State for expressing its views thereon, that is to say, on the provisions of the Bill framed under article 3.

Now, kindly see what the Bill was. Just look at clauses 8, 9 and 10. Clause 8 reads:

"As from the appointed day, there shall be formed a new Part C State to be known as the State of Bombay comprising the following territories, namely:—..".

That clause says that there shall be a new State of Bombay.

Then, clause 9 reads:

"As from the appointed day, there shall be formed a new Part A State to be known as the

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

> State of Maharashtra comprising the following territories, namely:—....".

Then, under item (a), certain districts of Bombay are mentioned. Item (b) mentions Aurangabad and certain other districts of Marathwada, which form part of the existing State of Hyderabad. Under item (c), we have Buldana and other districts, which mean Vidarbha in the existing State of Madhya Pradesh.

Clause 10 reads:

> "As from the appointed day, there shall be formed a new Part A State to be known as the State of Gujarat comprising the following territories, namely:—.....".

Then, under item (a), we have Gujarat proper, comprising the areas which now form part of the existing State of Bombay. Under item (b), we have the territories of the existing State of Saurashtra, and under item (c), we have the territories of the existing State of Kutch.

Now, what is happening here? Take, for instance, the Madhya Pradesh State Legislature. The Vidarbha people were asked, the members of the Madhya Pradesh Legislature were asked: 'You are now belonging to a bilingual State, namely the existing Madhya Pradesh State. Will you continue there, or will you go to the unilingual State of Maharashtra?'. That was the proposal before them.

So, the proposal in this Bill was whether Vidarbha, which is part of the existing State of Madhya Pradesh should go to the unilingual State of Maharashtra or should it continue as a part of a bilingual State. They had never the chance of giving their verdict on the proposal that is now made. Their wishes were never consulted. The President never referred this matter to them at all. He never asked them 'Will you go to the bilingual State of Bombay, along with Maharashtra, Gujarat, Kutch and Saurashtra?'. This proposal was never placed before them.

Again, kindly look at item (b) under clause 9(1), which reads:

> "Aurangabad, Parbhani, Bhir and Osmanabad districts....".

This item refers to Aurangabad and other areas of Marathwada, which now form part of the existing State of Hyderabad. This Bill also went to the Hyderabad State Legislature. As you know, Sir, Hyderabad is a multilingual State. The Marathwada people were asked, the Legislature of Hyderabad was asked, under article 3 of the Constitution, to give their views. Now, what was the matter on which their views were asked for? The matter was 'Will you, Marathwada people, continue in the existing multilingual State of Hyderabad, or will you join the unilingual State of Maharashtra?'. That was the only thing placed before them.

Now, kindly look at clause 10, which reads:

> "As from the appointed day, there shall be formed a new Part A State to be known as the State of Gujarat....".

Under this clause, the territories of the existing State of Saurashtra shall form part of a unilingual State of Gujarat. So, again, this new proposal was never placed before them.

This is a matter which is fundamental and which is basic. What I am pointing out is that you have got to apply the principle of pith and substance. You know that the Privy Council has said that when you have got to determine the legislative competence of a legislature with limited powers, which is functioning under a written Constitution, then you have to bear in mind that although technically you might call the Parliament sovereign, yet real sovereignty is reposed in the Constitution. The Constitution determines the ambit of our authority. Therefore, we function under the constitutional limits imposed by the Constitution. The Constitution says that the views of the Legislatures concerned must be ascertained on the proposals contained in the Bill. Now, what is the pith and substance?

You know that the Privy Council has laid down in *Gallagher vs. Lynn* (1937—*Appeal—Case* 863) that—

> "It is well established that you must look at the true nature and character of the legislation, which means the pith and substance of the legislation.".

Mr. Speaker: What is the book from which the hon. Member is reading?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I am reading from a judgment in the case of *Gallagher vs. Lynn*, an Irish case, where this point was raised, namely that when Parliament is legislating under a written Constitution, how much power Parliament can take. In that Irish case, the Privy Council said that:

> "It is well established that you must look at the true nature and character of the legislation, which means the pith and substance of the legislation.".

That is to say, you must find out whether the substance of the legislation was within the express powers. If not, it will be invalid.

What I am saying is this. Kindly look at the pith and substance of this legislation. Look at the true nature and character of this legislation. This passage has been quoted by our Supreme Court with approval, and they have said that the pith and substance doctrine is the doctrine which has got to be applied, when we are determining the ambit of the authority of Parliament or the ambit of authority of any legislature functioning under a written Constitution.

I am submitting for your consideration that if you look at clauses 9 and 10, you will find that the pith and substance was whether the State of Saurashtra should be merged in the State of Gujarat, whether the State of Kutch should be merged in the State of Gujarat, whether the Gujarat districts in the existing State of Bombay should belong to that unilingual State. But Shri Frank Anthony's amendment—however desirable it may be, and in fact, I am a great lover of Maharashtra and a great admirer of Gujarat—and Shri Tulsidas's amendment are in pith and substance a different Bill altogether. What they are saying is that as from the appointed day there shall not be any new State of Bombay; there shall be no new State of Maharashtra, and there shall be no new State of Gujarat. On the other hand, they are saying that there shall be a bilingual State comprising Maharashtra, Gujarat, Bombay, Vidarbha, Marathwada, Saurashtra and Kutch. What I am pointing out is this. Was Marathwada ever consulted on this? Was the Legislature of Madhya Pradesh ever given a chance to express its views on the question whether they should continue in one bilingual State to which they belonged or they should go to another bilingual State? That proposal was never put before them.

When that is the condition precedent, I am submitting that if my hon. friend the Home Minister is anxious to put it in, there must be an amending Bill, and that should be referred to the State Legislatures concerned. Before Parliament assumes legislative powers to redraw the political map of India, the particular provision which we are going to legislate must be referred by the President to the Legislatures of the States concerned, and the views of

[Sbri N. C. Chatterjee]

those Legislatures thereon, that is, on the particular provision must be obtained within the prescribed period. We have not gone so far as to make consent of the Legislatures a condition precedent. We have not said that referendum is a condition precedent, but we have only said that there should be prior consultation, and this democratic approach must be made. Parliament and all its Members taken together cannot arrogate to themselves the function and then say that although there has been no reference, yet they would assume that power. That will be an illegal assumption of power.

So, it is a deliberate, conscious self-imposed fetter which has been put by our Constitution-makers, on the assumption by Parliament of legislative competence. You know that if you change anything in the Constitution, it becomes an amendment to the Constitution. We have got elaborate provisions for that. But under article 4 (2), we have made an exception by saying:

> "No such law as aforesaid shall be deemed to be an amendment of this Constitution for the purposes of article 368.".

So, what I say is that although we are changing the Constitution, we must change it according to the prescribed procedure. You know that the Indian Union is a Union of States. The States are those specified in the First Schedule. Article 1(3) (a) is there. Article 1, clause 1 is there. You can not change it. But you must change the areas of States according to the provisions prescribed. That is the constitutional safeguard. (*Interruptions*).

I am submitting that it is not a question of irregularity. A corporation has got the power to do something. The directors can do it in a particular way. The directors may do something improper, but that is within the ambit of authority of the corporation. In such a case the corporation can ratify, can acquiesce in it. The Corporation can adopt it. But this kind of affirmation won't do here. It is not a question of irregularity here. It is a question of illegality. It is a question of a fundamental fetter which has been put upon the Parliament by the Constitution. It says, before you assume this legislative power to redraw the political map of India—you do it in any way you like—that particular proposal should be placed before the legislatures concerned. I am asking: stripped of all unessentials, had the people of Marathwada ever had an opportunity of expressing their views as to whether they would join this bilingual State now proposed? The issue before them was this: are you going to merge yourselves with the unilingual State of Maharashtra? They said, 'yes'. They had never an opportunity of considering the other proposal.

With great respect, the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission is irrelevant here. It is out of the picture. The States Reorganisation Commission gave us a Report for the purpose of our drafting the Bill. But once this Bill is drafted, you have got to go according to the clear wording of this section.

Therefore, what I am submitting is that the essential fetter has not yet been removed. The condition precedent to the assumption of legislative power has not been fulfilled. Unless that condition is fulfilled, Parliament is not competent to enact this legislation. I am not saying that you have got to take a very technical view of it. What I am emphasising is that you have got to interpret the Constitution in a liberal manner. Put as liberal a construction as you like. But when you find that the true nature, the content, and purport of the Bill is something different, radically different, fundamentally different, vitally different from that which was in the original

Bill, I submit you can only assume that power, Parliament can only take upon itself the authority to legislate, provided another amending Bill is introduced and that has been circulated to the legislatures and then placed before this House. Then and then only will Parliament be in a position to legislate. Otherwise, I submit that it cannot at all be considered by the House and we cannot pass any legislation.

Then would you kindly see article 255 of the Constitution? This is to implement the point that I am making. That article says:

> "No Act of Parliament or of the Legislature of a State specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule, and no provision in any such Act, shall be invalid by reason only that some recommendation or previous sanction required by this Constitution was not given, if assent to that Act was given—
>
> (a) where the recommendation required was that of the Governor, either by the Governor or by the President;
>
> (b) where the recommendation required was that of the Rajpramukh, either by the Rajpramukh or by the President;
>
> (c) where the recommendation or previous sanction required was that of the President, by the President".

In the proviso to article 3, there are two conditions imposed. The first condition is that there must be a recommendation by the President. The second condition is reference to the legislature and expression of their considered views on that particular provision in the Bill. The first fetter can be cured. Of course, it ought not to be done by Parliament because when Parliament's attention is drawn, naturally the Speaker will point out that it is not proper, because without the President's recommendation, you have got no jurisdiction. But the Constitution makes a distinction and says that curability can be effected only with regard to the first fetter. The second fetter is absolute. It is mandatory and admits of no exception or qualification. It cannot be cured even by the subsequent authorisation.

Therefore, I am submitting that this is a fundamentally different Bill, so far as the bilingual Bombay State is concerned. The four legislatures who are concerned, specially the legislatures of Saurasbtra, Madhya Pradesh and Hyderabad, had never had an opportunity of considering this matter at all. What was before them was only one issue: are you accepting the unilingual State or are you going to continue as you are? They might have said, 'we want a bilingual State; we are perfectly happy with the bilingual State in which we are now functioning and we shall continue there. What is the good of our taking a plunge in another bilingual State?' I am not on the question of merits, but I am discussing the intention of the Constitution-makers. The intention of the Constitution-makers was not to ride roughshod over popular will, but to give an opportunity through constitutional channels and through democratic methods to the representatives of the people to express their considered views on the matter and place them before Parliament. Then and then only will Parliament acquire the right to legislate in that domain. Unless and until that is done, I submit this lacuna cannot be got rid of. Therefore, this is not legal or proper.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Frank Anthony.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): He is not opposing the amendment. I want to raise a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Frank Anthony's amendment, No. 482, has been moved. Therefore, I must give him an opportunity.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: He wants to say that it is in order. My contention is that it is not in order. Therefore, I want to make my submission.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member himself has tabled an amendment. He has not moved his amendment No. 428. I am hearing those hon. Members who oppose this amendment and those who support this amendment. But I am not bound to hear every hon. Member. Anyhow, let him wait. There is no good showing impatience.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I thank you for that. What I was saying was only this, that I wanted to raise a point of order, apart from the one that has been raised by my hon. friend, and in support of that I wanted to make my submission.

Mr. Speaker: Let all the points of order be answered simultaneously. This is another point of order relating to the admissibility of amendment No. 462.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is quite true that I have also given notice of an amendment, No. 428. I maintain myself in this position that I am myself very happy that this bilingual State has come into being. I do not dispute the idea behind it, nor do I feel in any manner annoyed about what decisions have been reached.

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of estoppel.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I make this statement because it may be interpreted otherwise. I am not in opposition to amendment No. 462. What I oppose is only this much. I see very clearly the difficulties that are going to arise subsequently, when interested people might run to the Supreme Court or High Courts and obtain writs staying our hands. So that today we must be prepared for all manner of those difficulties that may arise at a later stage. I am at one with the arguments that have been advanced......

Mr. Speaker: The feasibility or otherwise need not be placed before us. What somebody may do, whether he takes it to the Supreme Court or not, we are not concerned with it. What is the point of order?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Apart from what has been suggested by Shri N. C. Chatterjee and Shri H. N. Mukerjee, I want to bring to your notice a very pertinent question, and that is with reference to article 4. Unfortunately, on a very casual reading, this article 4 makes our minds fixed on this question of supplemental, incidental and consequential provisions and we merely brush aside the exact significance of what that means. Before we want to interpret the provisions of article 4, *vis-a-vis* this new amendment that is being put forward to clauses 8, 9 and 10, I will ask you to read the provisions of article 368.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point? Hon. Members who raise points of order must first state the point and then support the point by arguments.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: My point is that this amendment which is now being made is going to affect the question of representation of members from that State to the Houses of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: That has become consequential.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: What I want to submit is that it is not consequential, that it does not come within the purview of article 4. Ordinarily, I would have immediately agreed with your view, to which I always attach great importance......

Mr. Speaker: When I put some question, no hon. Member need have any misunderstanding. I only want to clarify the point. I keep an open mind in all these matters.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: You will notice that article 368 lays down:

> "Provided that if such amendment seeks to make any change in—
>
> (d) the representation of States in Parliament,—"

The amendment shall also require to be ratified by the Legislatures of not less than one-half of the States specified in Parts A and B of the First Schedule by resolutions to that effect passed by those Legislatures before the Bill making provision for such amendment is presented to the President for assent.

The representation of States in Parliament is of two types; one is to the Council of States and one is to the Lok Sabha.

Article 4 says:

> "Any law referred to in article 2 or article 3 shall contain such provisions for the amendment of the First Schedule and the Fourth Schedule......"

The First Schedule refers to the names of the various States and the Fourth Schedule refers to the representation of the States in the Council of States. Neither of these has any mention whatsoever about the representation in the House of the People or the Lok Sabha. Therefore, my contention is this. If we read article 4, it says:—

> "..... shall contain such provisions for the amendment of the First Schedule and the Fourth Schedule as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of the law and may also contain such supplemental, incidental and consequential provisions (including provisions as to representation in Parliament and in the Legislature or Legislatures of the State or States affected by such law) as Parliament may deem necessary."

Mr. Speaker: It says: 'May also contain....'. If the hon. Member will read article 4, it says: 'shall contain such provisions for the amendment......'. This is obligatory. Then, it says, 'may also contain such supplemental, incidental and consequential provisions' etc. Parliament, in another article, has been defined as the President and both Houses. Therefore, it would mean this Lok Sabha also.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: That is what I am submitting. My submission is this; we should not override the provisions of article 368.

Mr. Speaker: I will immediately dispose of this point. We will assume that under article 4, amendments relating to Schedules I and IV have to be made in this Bill itself. We will assume that it cannot be made. That in the point which the hon. Member is making. He says that it cannot be made so far as the Lok Sabha is concerned because Schedule IV is concerned only with representation in the Council of States. If it cannot be provided for in this Bill, cannot this be done by an amendment of the Constitution itself?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is true.

Mr. Speaker: Then, what is the point of order?

The hon. Member will kindly remember that we are on this point whether it ought to be Bombay as originally set out or it should be with these additions. The hon. Member goes futher to say that if these additions are made, it will mean additional representation and you cannot give additional representation in this Bill. Another Constitution Amendment Bill may be brought wherein additional representation in the Lok Sabha can be given. I am not able to follow the point of order. If this is carried and additional representation cannot be treated as a consequential amendment and cannot be carried through in this Bill, it can be done by bringing some other Bill and saying that

[Mr. Speaker]

the bilingual State of Bombay shall have so many seats. Is that the point?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: You will kindly hear me. The Third Schedule is part and parcel of the States Reorganisation Bill.

Shri R. D. Misra (Bulandshahr Distt.): What is the point of order? We must know that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member says that now we have got a small Bombay State and we have given representation on that basis. But if a bigger Bombay comes into existence with Gujarat, Saurashtra and Kutch in the north and Maharashtra in the south including Vidarbha, then additional representation has to be given both in the Council of States and in the Lok Sabha correspondingly. Representation in the Council of States can be given by amending the Fourth Schedule for which a separate constitutional amendment is not necessary; it can be done in this Bill. But, according to him, article 4 does not refer to a modification of representation regarding the Lok Sabha. I do not agree because it is cumulative and not one excluding the other. Even if we accept his interpretation of article 4 that it could not be introduced here, he agrees with me that a separate amendment to the Constitution may be brought in wherein a provision can be made for the representation of bigger Bombay in this House. I cannot understand why such a consequential amendment being made in the Constitution should stand in the way of this. If this amendment is carried, we may have to make some other amendment somewhere. Let us look into that matter later. But let it not stand in the way of this amendment being carried out here. I cannot understand his point.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: That is what I wanted to point out. In this States Reorganisation Bill we have got the Third Schedule which gives the number of seats in the House of the People.

Mr. Speaker: I will ignore that. When we come to the Third Schedule, it may be contended that it is not covered by article 4 of the Constitution and, therefore, it must be brought in by way of an amendment of the Constitution.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: If any such variation has to be made we will have to take recourse to article 368. Only article 368 will govern such amendments. If it merely makes an alteration in the representation in the Council of States, it can be done here: but if it makes any change whatsoever in the representation in the Lok Sabha, then, we will have to go to article 368. This is one point.

The second point that I wish to point out is with reference to article 3.

Mr. Speaker: Another new point!

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Yes: we have to be cognizant of this fact that the provision in article 3, before it was amended, was like this.

> "......the views of the Legislature of the State or, as the case may be, of each of the States both with respect to the proposal to introduce the Bill and with respect to the provisions thereof have been ascertained by the President."

Mr. Speaker: That has been changed.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Yes, that has been changed, and the change has been of this type. Article 3 states "unless where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the area, boundaries or the name of any of the States specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule, the Bill has been referred by the President to the Legislature of that State for expressing its views thereon...." and so there are three things coming in--affecting of the area, affecting of the boundaries and affecting of the name. The views must be expressed with reference to these three things. In this particular instance, the views of these States to which reference has been made by the President, have only been with reference to these three things. If this amendment brings in something new, brings in some new area boundaries etc., which are of a different nature from the one on which they have expressed their views, then my submission is that this Bill is *ultra vires* of the Constitution.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): I shall point out one or two conditions and would like to add one or two new points.

Mr. Speaker: I am now calling upon the hon. Member, Shri Frank Anthony, who has tabled an amendment. If there are any new points, I will certainly hear.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated Anglo-Indians): The amendment is completely in order. As my learned friend, Shri Chatterjee has pointed out, the amended article 3 postulates two conditions—

> "Parliament may by law form a new State by separation of territories from any State or by uniting two or more States......"

The conditions precedent are that before Parliament does this, the Bill has to be introduced on the recommendation of the President. Here we are dealing only with principles. What has been done now? The first condition is that the Bill has to be introduced on the recommendation of the President. When we had the Bill, I forget the number, was it not introduced on the recommendation of the President? The first condition, I submit has been satisfied. The second condition to which Shri Chatterjee has drawn attention is that as the Bill affects the area, boundaries or name of any of the States specified in Part A or Part B of the First Schedule, it has to be referred to the Legislatures concerned for their views. Was that particular Bill referred to these Legislatures or not? My submission is that it was referred to the concerned Legislatures. The Bill itself was referred and I shall deal with the point whether the provisions of the Bill are of a different character. I ask: Was the Bill referred to the Legislatures? Yes.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): The Bill in which this proposal is contained......

Shri Frank Anthony: I shall show that it is a complete fallacy. Shri Chatterjee, who also referred to this fact, stated that the American and Australian Constitutions have got certain provisions. A comparison of article 3 shows that we have deliberately sought to depart completely from the provisions in the American and Australian Constitutions. There the consent of the Legislature is a condition precedent. Here all that we do is to get the views of the Legislature. My respectful submission here is that it is only procedural, and there is no sanctity with regard to their views. You put a certain provision there and that will be discussed before the Legislature. The Legislature may consider not only that provision but all manner of cognate provisions, including the S.R.C. recommendations and give their views. We have gone further. We have given power to the President. We have done it and Shri Chatterjee had a grievance against that provision in the Constitution. We can ignore the views of the Legislatures; we can absolutely ignore them. Then we have a further provision that the President may specify a period within which the views must be received by him from the Legislature. If the Legislatures do not give their views within that period, we need not wait further. There is absolutely no sanctity attached to this question of securing their views. It is purely procedural. We can ignore their views; we need not wait for their views after the specified period has expired.

My respectful submission to Shri Chatterjee's contention is that it is a complete misreading of article 3 to say that we cannot modify the Bill. As I said, the Bill was introduced on the recommendation of the President. So, the first condition was satisfied. Whatever its form, the Bill was sent to the Legislatures, concerned for their views. When it comes to us,—that is the core of the matter—what is our

[Shri Frank Anthony]

power and what can we do with the Bill? I say that we cannot only modify but we can change it completely; we can, to put it colloquially, play ducks and drakes with the Bill within our own rules. Shri Chatterjee is out of court completely....

Shri Sadhan Gupta: He is not in court.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: In Parliament.

Shri Frank Anthony: What is the position of Shri Chatterjee? What was the Bill referred to originally? It was that Bombay State should be separate. My hon. friend, Shri Chatterjee wants that we should include Bombay city in Maharashtra. Was that proposal before the Legislatures? It was not before the Legislatures and yet Shri Chatterjee wants us to do it. If according to Shri Chatterjee we can do that and add a separate Bombay State to Maharashtra, then I say that we cannot only add a separate Bombay but also add Gujarat to it. I am quite clear in my mind about this matter and the position is simple. For instance If the Bill as it was originally remitted to the Legislatures, had a provision that we should have a larger bilingual composite State and we in our wisdom said "No, we shall have three separate States, Maharashtra, Bombay and Gujarat", are we not competent to do that? Almost certainly we are competent. If we could break up the original composite State, then the converse proposition is also true. We can form a composite State. My friend wants Bombay State to be added to Maharashtra. What are we doing now? We are conceding his request and we are adding a little more. That is all what we are doing. I submit that it would be a complete negation of article 3 to say that the Bill in its original form as referred to the States must bring to those States the proposal in the specific form in which we pass. Then, what happens to us? What happens to the Joint Committee? Look at this principle. Tomorrow we may say that Belgaum will be given to Maharashtra as Maharashtrians are wanting it, but according to Shri Chaterjee, "No, no, it cannot go".

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: My hon. friend has not appreciated my point unfortunately. I was drawing the attention of the House to the pith and substance principle and said that on that basis this is a fraud on the Constitution.

Shri Frank Anthony: The pith and substance principle which Shri Chatterjee referred to and the division of the legislative functions have nothing to do with this. I am showing not the pith and substance but literally what we are doing is absolutely within our power. I have shown that if we could add Bombay, we could certainly add Gujarat as well. What would happen it we accepted the principle of pith and substance? If for instance we wanted to add Belgaum to Maharashtra, on the analogy of Shri Chatterjee's argument, that matter was not before the Legislature and so we have to send it back. In that way we will be in a constant or continued process of shuttlecocking this matter backward and forward. To my mind, there are only two principles: the recomendation of the President, which has been done; the Bill has to be remitted for the views of the Legislature, which has also been done. When the Bill comes within the ambit of our rules, I say we can change it beyond all recognition.

Shri Raghavachari *rose—*

Some Hon. Members *rose—*

Mr. Speaker: How many hon. Members of the House want me to hear? I have heard both the opposition Members and also the Mover of the amendment. Is it not enough if I hear only one or two Members and then ask the Government to answer? It should be understood that we are not going into the merits at all; we discuss only the constitutional position,

Shri Raghavachari: I have listened to the arguments of Shri Chatterjee and also Shri Frank Anthony. I am very sorry to say that Shri Anthony's argument is fallacious, incorrect—and wholly incorrect. If his advice is correct, then the Government has erred in sending the Bihar and Bengal Bill relating to the reorganisation of Bengal and Bihar, because we can play ducks and drakes as Anthony says with anything here. It means that the Government has been wrongly advised and they have accepted an incorrect advice.

We have to make a distinction between the Rules of Procedure and the constitutional requirements when we have to consider whether this amendment is in order or out of order. If you take the Rules of Procedure ,it will be perfectly in order because, when there is a Bill, you can introduce any kind of amendment consistent with the scope of the Bill So, there is this confusion and mixing up of the Rules of Procedure that ordinarily apply to the amendments and the requirements of the Constitution.

How is the present amendment unconstitutional? People may ask? It is an extraordinary procedure which I have not seen in the Rules of Procedure durtng these five years on the floor of this House. The principle of an amendment is to be accepted and a new amendment will be drafted and brought in.

Mr. Speaker: Let us not go into the subject-matter. There is an amendment here, No. 462. This requires some amendment. To that extent this will be detained

Shri Raghavachari: My point is this. The principle is accepted now and a new amendment will be drafted

Pandit G. B. Pant: I have given notice of an amendment.

Shri Ragbavachari: Is it a new amendment?

Mr. Speaker: it is an amendment to the amendment if the substance is known and has been discussed and if a new amendment of the same substance is given, it is only a question of waiving the notice.

Shri Raghavachari: When the amendment is accepted by the Government, it becomes a proposal of the Government and when it becomes a proposal of the Government, it is a proposal which should have been included in the original Bill that was circulated to the States for expression of an opinion.

Shri Anthony was pointing out that there has been the recommendation of the President. I agree. The next thing is that the Bill with the provisions contained in it must be sent to the States for expressing their opinion. There is no need to wait for their opinion of conform to that opinion. But the constitutional requirement is that the proposals contained in the Bill must be sent to the States for expression an opinion. If you have not done that, it is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker: There is no new point that has been raised. The hon. Member has spoken at length. No emphasis of what has already been said is necessary.

Shri Raghavachari: The other thing is only this. If the States are to be Ignored to the extent of not even conforming to certain Constitutional formalities and they are not given an opportunity to express their opinion, it is certainly unconstitutional, and killing the spirit of the Constitution and, to use a very strong language, it almost borders on defrauding the spirit of the Constitution.

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: I will call upon the hon. Minister. Points of order have only to be stated. If there are some doubts some hon. Members or the Chair will ask for elucidation for the benefit of the Members and for the benefit of the Chair itself. Now, enough has been said. Further arguments to support or strengthen the

[Mr. Speaker]

point by way of illustration, this or that, are not necessary. I will call upon the hon. Minister.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): Only one question on a point of information.

Mr. Speaker: If it is only a point of information, I will call upon the hon. Minister.

The Minister of Legal Affairs (Shri Pataskar): The point of order that has been raised by Shri Chatterjee, and before him, by Shri Mukerjee, amounts to this: whether the amendment No. 462 is *ultra vires* of the Constitution, or, whether it is a fraud on the Constitution, as suggested by an hon. Member Shri Chatterjee felt that the pith, as he called it, and the substance of the Bill is affected by the proposed amendment.

As was rightly pointed out by Shri Anthony, we need not have recourse to the provisions of the American or Australian Constitution. The provisions are entirely different there. We have a written Constitution which specifically lays down as to what is to be done with respect to a Bill of this nature. Article 3 lays down that Parliament may by law form a new State by separation of territory from any State or by uniting two or more States or parts of States or by uniting any territory to a part of any State. That is article 3(a) and the present Bill falls under this category. What is the proviso?

> "Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliament except on the recommendation of the President."

It is not the idea to put certain restrictions on the powers of Parliament with respect to what is to be done by Parliament in regard to a Bill of this nature. That is to be kept before us in order that we may properly assess the importance of the provision. In this case, nobody has challenged the President's approval. The provisio further goes on:

> "....and unless where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the boundaries of any State or States specified in Part A or Pert B of the First Schedule....the views of the Legislature of the State or, as the case may be, of each of the States...."

It must be clearly understood that the requirements of the Constitution are only two. First is the sanction of the President. The second is that the President should send these Bills to the States for their opinion. Are we to infer from this that the intention of the Constitution was that whenever such a Bill was sent to the States, Parliament's power to deal with such Bills which it has already got is going to be effected by anything contained in this article? That is the main point which, probably, I think, some hon. Members have failed to notice. There was no intention to put any clog on the manner in which a Bill, after it is introduced in the Parliament shall be dealt. What the Constitution has done is that it has laid down two conditions which should be fulfilled before such a Bill is brought before the Parliament. In this case that has been done. So, I believe that the question of this being *ultra vires* or a fraud on the Constitution is mere exaggeration which, I think, does not stand the test of any correct interpretation of the Constitution.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: (Visakhapatnam): If that is so, why don't you bring in the provisions relating to Bengal-Bihar within the ambit of this Bill? Why did you send it as a separate Bill to the State Legislatures concerned?

Shri Pataskar: That probably is altogether a different question. I will come to that later. I would request hon. Members not to interrupt me like this. Here we are only discussing the question from the constitutional point of view.

Let us now ascertain or examine whether it is a fraud on the Constitution, whether what is being tried to be done by this amendment is something which we ought not to do even if it were a Bill which is ordinarily introduced without these impediments having been there. Now, this is a Bill which, on the face of it, seeks to provide for the reorganisation of States of India and for matters connected therewith. That is the general thing. Then, the amendment proposed is to clauses 8, 9 and 10. Clause 8 relates to the Union Territory of Bombay and says what it shall be. Clause 9 deals with the formation of Maharashtra State and clause 10 relates to the formation of Gujerat State. As hon. Members are aware, what is it that is being tried to be done by these provisions? These provisions were in the Bill and they were circulated to the State Legislatures concerned, who were going to be affected by the proposals contained in the clauses 8, 9 and 10. We have got the opinions of those people and I can point out innumerable passages in the proceedings of those very Houses to which this Bill was referred, wherein they considered it from every point of view; whether there should be the proposal contained in the Bill or some other arrangement should be made with respect to the reorganisation of the area.

The whole question is that the proposals contained in clauses 8, 9 and 10 relate to the reorganisation of areas relating to the present State of Bombay which includes parts of Maharashtra, Gujerat and Bombay City. Clause 9 proposes that part of this Gujerat should be linked with Kutch and Saurashtra, the other part, which is Maharashtra, in the Bombay State should be linked with Vidarbba and Marathwada area and Bombay City, the third part, should be kept as a separate territory. That was the scheme of reorganisation as it was proposed in the Bill. It is not as if clauses 8, 9 and 10 are something different. All these matters relating to the reorganisation of these areas were communicated to the State Legislature affected by the provisions contained in clauses 8, 9 and 10 of this Bill.

Now, what is tried to be done is this. The proposal was that Gujerat area should be there with Saurashtra and Kutch, Maharashtra should be there with Vidarbha and Marathwada and the City should remain a separate territory. When the matter comes before the Parliament, we say by this amendment that instead of having three units as proposed let us have an arrangement in which Gujerat with Saurashtra and Kutch, Maharashtra with Vidarbha and Marathwada and the Bombay City which was tried to be kept separate, shall be included.

What I would like to submit is this. There is a scheme for the reorganisation of the whole area which is contained in clauses 8, 9 and 10. Is it to be said that as soon as such a proposal is made by the Government and it is submitted to the States, then we can make no change whatsoever in it? What is it that we are doing? I can understand if we were trying to add some other area which was not there in the first instance. In that case there is some force in the argument. But here this is a specific matter about the reorganisation of this area which is contained in clauses 8, 9 and 10 and it was referred to the States concerned. That is the only requirement according to the Constitution. Instead of accepting the proposal which is there, or accepting the proposal of my friend Shri Chatterjee to only add Bombay to Maharashtra—or somebody else may have said that you remove Saurashtra or something else—we are accepting another proposal of Shri Frank Anthony that instead of accepting Bombay being either linked with Maharashtra or Gujerat or something else, you link all these areas together with Bombay. What is the fraud on the Constitution? All these proposals had been sent to all the State Legislatures as required under the Constitution. I believe, if we

[Shri Pataskar]

once lay down this principle that whenever proposals of this nature are made we cannot interfere with them that means whenever such proposals are there this Parliament shall not interfere in the matter. It would be a wrong thing to do and it would be entirely against the spirit of the Constitution. I believe no amount of interpretation could say that the Constitution laid down or tried to interfere in any way with the powers of the Parliament. On the contrary, what it says is that before you introduce such a Bill, before the introduction stage, you should ascertain the views of the States concerned. That has been done. We have also got the sanction of the President. These are the only two impediments, looking to the importance of the Bill, which our Constitution, at any rate, has provided for in article 3 of the Constitution. I think it is a simple proposition and not only it is not *ultra vires* but, merely because there is a change, which does not suit some people—some people do not like that, there may be very good reasons for that—that is no justification for saying that it is a fraud on the Constitution. There are only big words and they carry us nowhere.

The only thing here is that the scheme of reorganisation is before the Parliament. The Parliament wants to deal with this question of reorganisation. It is only with respect to the areas that are contained in clauses 8, 9 and 10 that the change is made. Even in respect of that, as I pointed out earlier, when this matter was referred to the States, in the Bombay State particularly, I find a number of speeches—I do not want to quote them—where the people have been considering whether Bombay should be a multi-lingual State with both Gujerat and Maharashtra, whether it should remain separate, what part should it comprise of and all that. All these matters are there. The only purpose of that provision in the Constitution is that we should be able to know the views of the people in the States concerned. In no way does the Constitution imply that there shall be any clog on the powers of this Parliament.

I, therefore, say, that no point of order has been raised.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think the position is quite plain and it does not admit of any difference of opinion. As Shri Pataskar has just stated, Article 3 lays down that before a Bill is introduced the approval of the President should be obtained. That is one. Secondly, the Bill should have been referred to the States concerned. Both these conditions have been fulfilled. The Bill was introduced. Nobody had any objection to the introduction of the Bill on the ground of any of the conditions prescribed in Article 3 not having been fulfilled. Now, after that there is nothing to restrict the jurisdiction or the powers of Parliament.

This is a Bill for the reorganisation of States. The very title is "The States Reorganisation Bill" and it says: "A Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the States of India and for matters connected therewith".

Now, the Bill, in clauses 8, 9 and 10 mentions certain territories. Those territories, according to the Bill, were to be organised in a certain manner. The territories are there. They were before the States concerned. They were to be organised in a particluar way. Now the Parliament has to deal with these clauses 8, 9 and 10. Is it or is it not open to Parliament to say that these territories will be reorganised in a different way and not in the manner in which the Bill has proposed? That means that the territories are mentioned there. We are not adding anything which is not in the Bill. So, whether we can or we cannot, that question does not arise. But, in this particular case only the territories that are mentioned in clauses 8, 9 and 10 are to be combined together and instead of forming three different units they are to form one.

Now, I may just elucidate the point by saying that there is a proposal in this Bill that the State of Madhya Bharat, the State of Vindhya Pradesh, the State of Bhopal and the Maha Koshal part of Madhya Pradesh, should form one composite State. Now, is it or is it not open to this Parliament to say no, we will not have this composite State consisting of these three or four States, but each of these will remain a separate State, or that only two of these will form one group and the other two will form another group? Are we prevented by any rules from making any alterations in that and saying no, we will not have a composite State here, we will have these States separately; these four States will continue as they were; or to say that Bhopal and Madhya Bharat will form one unit and Mahakoshal and Vindhya Pradesh will form another group? What is there to prevent Parliament from doing so? I do not think that there is anything by way of fraud—a word which is used very freely in law courts. I do not know if we can use it here as frequently as we use it there.

2 P.M.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: It is a forensic expression. The hon. the Home Minister knows that it is meant to indicate arbitrary use of legislative powers.

Pandit G. B. Pant: It may be forensic, but not very graceful in Parliament.

What I was saying was this. We are entitled to amend any clause we like and when the territories are there the regrouping has to be allowed. Then it is strange that though this amendment was discussed for three, four or five days with the utmost vigour, nobody said that this amendment was out of order. Everyone thought that it was in order and that was the right attitude. But then they looked for some method that would enable them to raise some objections and found that perhaps this would come handy.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: On a point of order, are these observations permissible on a point of order—as to the motives behind.

Pandit G. B. Pant: There is no motive; it is a fact that for days together the matter was argued and no objection was raised.

Then certain other proposals were made to which reference has been made by Mr. Anthony that Bombay and Maharashtra should be combined. If Bombay and Maharashtra can be combined, then Bombay, Gujerat and Maharashtra can be combined. I do not see how two can be combined, and not three. There is no rule of three here, nor any rule of two. So, it is permissible.

I may also mention that the Constitution itself lays down as to when a special permission is needed for an amendment. For example, article 117 says:

> "(1) A Bill or amendment making provision for any of the matters specified in sub-clauses (a) to (f) of clause (1) of article 110 shall not be introduced or moved except on the recommendation of the President and a Bill making such provisions shall not be introduced in the Council of States:
>
> Provided that no recommendation shall be required under this clause for the moving of an amendment making provision for the reduction or abolition of any tax.
>
> (2) A Bill or amendment shall not be deemed to make provision for any of the matters aforesaid by reason only that it provides for the imposition of fines, etc., etc."

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

There are also other articles in which it is specifically laid down that an amendment cannot be made without the approval of some authority. But for such exceptions, the Parliament has within its jurisdiction to deal with a Bill that is introduced in Parliament. It may alter it, it may amend it.

Suppose Parliament in its discretion and judgment ultimately says: this Bill is rejected, none of these proposals is accepted. Is there anything to prevent Parliament from doing so? If Parliament can reject then cannot Parliament make some minor alterations in the provisions of the Bill itself? To say that it cannot would be illogical.

Then reference was made to the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill and it was asked as to why it was not incorporated in this Bill. No reference of this Bill was made to Bengal or Bihar at all. The provisions about Bengal or Bihar did not appear in this Bill in any form whatsoever. In fact at the time when this Bill was placed on the Table of this House before it was circulated, it was said that the question of the merger of Bengal and Bihar was under consideration, so a separate Bill with regard to Bengal and Bihar would be introduced later. Under Article 3 the condition precedent that the Bill should be referred to the States concerned before it could be introduced here has not been fulfilled with regard to Bengal and Bihar. But with regard to these States no one can argue that no reference had been made of this Bill to Bombay, or Gujerat or Maharashtra or Saurashtra or Hyderabad. All these States affected have been consulted. So, I do not see any point in the objections that have been raised by Shri Chatterjee or by Professor Mukerjee. I think it is a plain thing and the jurisdiction of Parliament should not in any way be restricted or curtailed on imaginary grounds.

Shri Kamath: On a point clarification or enlightenment by you. Yesterday you were pleased to hold that certain amendments sought to be moved by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava were outside the scope of the Bill on certain grounds. Under your present ruling, I do not see how they could be held out of order, or outside the scope of the Bill. If that ruling holds good, this amendment is also outside the scope of the Bill.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttak): May I have a clarification that in the Joint Committee I had given an amendment for the inclusion of certain areas from Bihar into Orissa and from Madhya Pradesh into Orissa. They were ruled out of order because they had not been considered by the States concerned.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard sufficiently the arguments relating to this point of order. As was pointed out by the hon. the Home Minister, though a point of order can be raised at any time, normally to avoid spending away the valuable time of the House, hon. Members ought to raise such point of order as an amendment is moved, and Members begin to speak on that amendment. Now we have spent precious days over this matter. As a matter of fact, as was pointed out by some hon. Members, though this States Reorganisation Bill affects large territories of India, with the exception of one or two—Bengal and Bihar which have been relegated to some other Bill—the major portion of the time has been taken on a discussion over Bombay and the areas connected therewith. Therefore in propriety and to do justice to this House, such points of order ought to be raised at the time when the amendment is moved. I am not, however, going to rule the point out on that ground.

The main point is that this amendment, No. 462 seeks to retain the existing State of Bombay with some additions in the north, some additions in the south and some portions left out. Originally it was contemplated in the Bill that the State of Bombay should be divided into three groups of areas: the City of Bombay, with some area round about to be administered directly by the Central Government; the northern portion with Saurashtra and Kutch to be formed into the State of Gujerat; and the Southern area with some areas taken from Madhya Pradesh and Hyderabad to be formed into the State of Maharashtra. This was the grouping contained in the Bill which was sent to the various States for their expression of opinion.

Now the point that has been raised is that instead of leaving Bombay separately from Maharashtra and Gujerat all of them are now being thrown together and this matter also must have been sent to the various States for their opinion, at any rate to give them an opportunity of giving vent to their opinions regarding these proposals. Now let us see whether article 3 applies to this amendment. My own feeling and my own opinion is that article 3 does not apply to this amendment at all. Article 3 refers to the introduction of a Bill for which two conditions are necessary; firstly, the recommendation of the President and secondly, the sending of the Bill to the various Legislature for getting their views on the proposals. In the original article of the Constitution, the wordings were different. Now, neither the decisions of the various States are invited nor is it necessary to send every provision of the Bill to the various legislatures. Further, the decisions of the various legislatures are not asked, but only their views or opinions. So far as this Bill is concerned, both the provisions are satisfied.

When once the Bill comes before the House, the House is in posession of it and it is in possession of every amendment that is sought to be moved for amending any provisions of the Bill. It is open to the States to give their views or opinions on the Bill, but the ultimate authority is given to this House to pass or reject the Bill. This Parliament is the ultimate authority. It is not as if we can say only what those legislatures have said or expressed about the Bill. It is not a question of dittoing what they have said.

Now. I was myself most anxious to refer to the matter raised by Shri N. C. Chatterjee and ask him clearly as to how the other articles of the Constitution make a difference relating to amendments and the introduction of the Bill. There are four stages: introduction of the Bill, consideration of the Bill, moving of amendments and then the final discussion for passing the Bill. There are three articles in the Constitution relating to recommendations to be made by the President on particular Bills. One of them is article 3 relating to the introduction. Article 117 relates to both introduction and amendments. No Bill or amendment shall be introduced or moved without the recommendation of the President under article 117.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: It relates to financial Bills.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Where the President's recommendation is necessary, and if the recommendation is intended only for introduction, the Constitution says so. If the recommendation is necessary for an amendment also, the Constitution says so. The person who moves the amendment is not necessarily the person who introdueed the Bill, as in this case. The Government have introduced this Bill, and the Government is not the person who tabled the amendment.

An ingenious argument has been advanced before the House by Shri Raghavachari. He said that the moment any amendment is made, the mover of the Bill signifies his assent to accept the amendment and that it becomes a proposal of the Government! If he keeps quiet and ultimately asks his partymen to vote for it, will he say that the amendment should be placed before the various Legislatures for their opinion? Can the amendment be converted into a

[Mr. Speaker]

proposal for which the State legislatures must again be asked to give their opinion? Should it be sent again to the various State legislatures for getting their opinion? Then that amendment becomes a Bill I cannot accept his argument.

So far as the present amendment is concerned, if we accept the argument of Shri N. C. Chatterjee, we will be denying to ourselves the right to discuss the matter, and we will be denying to this Parliament its prerogative and exclusive jurisdiction to discuss the matter. It is not as if the States decide this matter. The States had not even expressed their considered opinion on this matter. Though a majority of the State legislatures or a majority of Members in the State legislatures are allowed an opportunity to give expression to their views on the matter, it is for this House to consider or not to consider the provisions. It is not laid down in article 3 that for the purposes of an amendment, or in the alternative, for the purposes of recommendation, the amendment should be placed before the various legislatures for the expression of their views. Therefore, it is no good restricting article 3 only in this regard, by such an interpretation. Wherever the Constitution wants to impose such restrictions, it is mentioned both in article 117 and article 274, though no doubt, there may be occasions arising only with respect to financial matters and with respect of interpretation when expressions of views might have to be obtained. The way in which the Constitution has treated them should apply to all the other articles also. Therefore, I am definitely of the opinion that the requirements of article 3 have been satisfied in the matter of introduction of this Bill and also in the Bill having been sent to the various State legislatures, at this stage, for their views on the matter. Apart from the views of the State legislatures, nothing applies so far as the amendment is concerned.

Then it could have been possibly argued—though it has not been, except in a different manner—that the pith and the substance ought to be taken into consideration That arises this way. An amendment cannot be allowed if it is not within the scope of the Bill. Now, an analogy in relation to the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill has been quoted There is no analogy at all The questions relating to Bihar and West Bengal did not constitute a part of the original Bill at all. Not a single portion relating to Bihar and West Bengal territories was mentioned there. Of course, permutations and combinations are possible. But then, is it not for this House to say, "Reject clause 8"? If clause 8 is rejected, the existing state of affairs will continue. Merely because a Bill has been introduced here, the State of Bombay has not disappeared The State of Bombay continues until an alteration takes place. If clause 8 is not voted for, and is thrown out, what will happen? Bombay will continue to exist. If the question for separate Maharashtra is voted out what will happen? It will continue to exist!

Under the circumstances, are we to go back and ask the State legislatures, "We are trying out different proposals, and what do you say for that?" The Parliament has got the right to decide these matters For instance, some hon. Member—I believe it is Shri Altekar,—has given some amendments saying that Kolaba and some other portions ought to be given to Maharashtra. Are we in a position to accept it or should we once again go to the several States for opinion? Are we to go up and down to every State legislature for accepting or rejecting such amendments? As was rightly said by Shri Frank Anthony, are we to do that?

It may be said that this is a major improvement. It may be said that this amendment is a major improvement. So far as this point is concerned, let us look from the point of view of existing Bombay State. What is it that is interfered with? It is the existing State of Bombay. The existing State of Bombay is sought to be divided into three areas, attaching some portions to some other States and detaching some portions from the existing State. How is the amendment regarding these changes beyond the scope of the Bill? How is the amendment regarding the formation of one bigger State of Bombay,—attaching some portions to the existing State—beyond the scope of the Bill? As a matter of fact, I have got with me the reports of the various speeches made in the Bombay Legislative Assembly. They have addressed themselves to permutations and combinations of this State of Bombay. They have expressed their views, and various individual Members have given their views. Whether they have been crystallised in the form of a decision or not is another matter. The Constitution advisedly avoids any reference to a decision on these matters. Under these circumstances, neither this House, nor the country at large is taken by surprise by such an amendment. All the hon. Members have come here to put things properly in the best interests of the country.

Nothing can be unanimous. Here and there, there may be some difference of opinion and things may be put differently.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: Is the Chair considering the new proposals now?

Mr. Speaker: I am saying that this amendment is not beyond the scope of this Bill. It is within the scope of this Bill to put various parts together or separating some parts from the rest or including two or three parts in one, etc. This is not beyond the scope of the Bill, nor is it irrelevant or inconsistent. The amendment is quite in keeping with the scheme of the Bill.

Further, the House and the whole country had ample opportunities to discuss the Bill, and particularly, the Bombay legislature, the Saurashtra legislature and the Hyderabad legislature. All these legislatures had opportunities to go into this matter, and therefore, no error of justice has been done.

Lastly, I have looked into the question of *ultra vires*. The Chair does not take the responsibility for decisions of the House. All matters have been heard and are decided by the House. I will put the matter to the vote of the House. As it looks now, the House seems to be in favour of all these changes.

I will conclude by saying that article 3 does not apply to this amendment. It is not necessary to have the President's recommendation and it is not necessary to send the Bill again to the State legislatures. The amendment is not beyond the scope of the Bill. These are my considered views, and this is my opinion on the point of order.

If there are any small amendments with respect to amendment No. 462, the House may take them up now.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Some areas have been left out formerly. Now they have been included. I will move this new amendment.

I beg to move:

Pages 5 and 6—

for clauses 8 to 10, *substitute*:

"8. *Formation of a new Bombay State.*—(1) As from the appointed day, there shall be formed a new Part A State to be known as the State of Bombay comprising the following territories, namely:—

(a) the territories of the existing State of Bombay, excluding—

(i) Bijapur, Dharwar and Kanara districts and Belgaum district except Chandgad taluka, and

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

(ii) Abu Road taluka of Banaskantha district;

(b) Aurangabad, Parbhani, Bhir and Osmanabad districts, Ahmadpur, Nilanga and Udgir taluks of Bidar district, Nanded district (except Bichkonda and Jukkal circles of Deglur taluk and Mudhol, Bhiansa and Kuber circles of Mudhol taluk) and Islapur circle of Boath taluk, Kinwat taluk and Rajura taluk of Adilabad district, in the existing State of Hyderabad;

(c) Buldana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda districts in the existing State of Madhya Pradesh;

(d) the territories of the existing State of Saurashtra; and

(e) the territories of the existing State of Kutch;

and thereupon the said territories shall cease to form part of the existing States of Bombay, Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh, Saurashtra and Kutch, respectively.

(2) The said Chandgad taluka shall be included in, and become part of, Kolhapur district, the said Ahmadpur, Nilanga and Udgir taluks shall be included in, and become part of, Osmanabad district, the said Islapur circle of Boath taluk, Kinwat taluk and Rajura taluk shall be included in, and become part of, Nanded district and the territories comprised in the existing State of Kutch shall form a separate district to be known as Kutch district, in the new State of Bombay."

Mr. Speaker: Amendment moved:

Page 5 and 6—

for clauses 8 to 10 *substitute*:

"8. *Formation of a new Bombay State.*—(1) As from the appointed day, there shall be formed a new Part A State to be known as the State of Bombay comprising the following territories, namely:—

(a) the territories of the existing State of Bombay, excluding—

(i) Bijapur, Dharwar and Kanara districts and Belgaum district except Chandgad taluka, and

(ii) Abu Road taluka of Banaskantha district;

(b) Aurangabad, Parbhani, Bhir and Osmanabad districts, Ahmadpur, Nilanga and Udgir taluks of Bidar districts, Nanded district (except Bichkonda and Jukkal circles of Deglur taluk and Mudhol, Bhiansa and Kuber circles of Mudhol taluk) and Islapur circle of Boath taluk, Kinwant taluk and Rajura taluk of Adilabad district, in the existing State of Hyderabad;

(c) Buldana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda districts in the existing State of Madhya Pradesh;

(d) the territories of the existing State of Saurashtra; and

(e) the territories of the existing State of Kutch;

and thereupon the said territories shall cease to form part of the existing States of Bombay, Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh, Saurashtra and Kutch, respectively.

(2) The said Chandgad taluka shall be included in, and become part of, Kalhapur district, the said Ahmadpur, Nilanga and Udgir taluks shall be included in, and become part of, Osmanabad district, the said Islapur circle of Boath taluk, Kinwat taluk and Rajura taluk shall be included in, and become part of Nanded District and the territories comprised in the existing State of Kutch shall form a separate district to be known as Kutch district, in the new State of Bombay."

Let me dispose of this amendment. Hon. Members might note the small variations here.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: On a point of order, Sir. There are certain amendments to the original Bill stating that Belgaum district should be added to Maharashtra and so on. Those amendments should be first put. They cannot be put in the present manner, because there is no Maharashtra State. Therefore, they will have to be given an opportunity to propose new amendments that certain taluks should be included or excluded; that opportunity should be given and those amendments should be first put to vote.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I submit that this amendment relates to clauses 8, 9 and 10 of the Bill? We have not disposed of clauses 2 to 7 and no voting has taken place on those clauses. Therefore, unless the amendments to those clauses are disposed of, I do not think it is proper or right for this Parliament to vote on amendments to clauses 8 to 10. As Mr. Deshpande has pointed out, certain earlier amendments relate to matters connected with this amendment. Unless they are disposed of, this cannot be put to the vote of the House.

Mr. Speaker: It is proper and legitimate that opportunities should be given for discussing and voting on incidental or ancillary matters arising out of this. For instance, hon. Members have tabled an amendment that Belgaum which has been assigned to Karnataka ought to be continued in Maharashtra. I will allow that amendment to be treated as an amendment to this. In the peculiar circumstances of the case, all those amendments which seek to add or substract territories from this will also be allowed.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Not after this amendment is carried; it must be before.

Shri S. S. More: May I draw your attention to one matter? When we propose that Belgaum and certain other taluks from Karwar district should be incorporated in the Bombay State, we have simultaneously tabled an amendment to clause 7, which deals with the Mysore, from which it will have to be eliminated. Those two amendments will be counter-part amendments.

Mr. Speaker: Whatever amendments have already been tabled seeking to include some portions in the Mysore State and detach them from the previous State of Bombay or seeking to include some portions back in Maharashtra and detach them from Mysore, will also be allowed to be moved. Hon. Members can move them now.

An Hon. Member: It is not easy.

Shri Bogawat (Ahmednagar South): I would like the Home Minister to consider amendments Nos. 510 and 511, because the formula is for all the four States.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members who have tabled amendments to the original clauses 7, 8 and 9 and which are not covered by this amendment might intimate the numbers of their amendments.

Shri S. S. More: They can write the numbers on a chit and place it on the table; and, those amendments ought to be taken as moved. Whether they are to be put to the vote of the House or not is another matter.

Shri Kamath: Now that this amendment has received the official imprimatur of the Government, the House may be given time to table amendments to this amendment, because the entire complexion has changed.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow hon. Members to move amendments seeking to add some new territory which

[Mr Speaker]

is not originally contemplated either in Bombay or Maharashtra or Gujarat.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Formerly the areas included in the proposed Maharashtra, Gujarat and Bombay have been given here. Some areas had been inadvertently omitted from the Bill and then a corrigendum was issued along with the Bill. In the amendment that was given, those areas have been left out. We have included them now.

Mr. Speaker: Those amendments which have been originally tabled seeking to detach some areas from Mysore and adding them to Maharashtra or seeking to detach some areas from Rajasthan, Abu for instance, and any such like amendments will continue to be amendments. I am suggesting to the hon. Home Minister that I will put those amendments to the vote of the House first, before I put the main amendment. Therefore, I must gather all the other amendments which seek to add or substract certain territories and also the incidental and consequential amendments. I suggest we may take those amendments tomorrow. In the meanwhile, we were on some other group of clauses and the debate can go on. The voting on the clauses 2 to 15 and 16 to 49 and the amendments to those clauses will be held over till tomorrow. We shall get along with clauses 50 to 70 now and the other clauses on which discussion has been going on. So far as clauses 2 to 15 and 16 to 49 are concerned, they, with all their amendments and the consequential amendments arising out of this amendment will all be disposed of tomorrow.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The amendment of the Home Minister may be circulated to Members.

Mr. Speaker: I will have it circulated.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: May I point out that article 3 provides that we can fix the area or the boundary of a State? We cannot fix the boundary of a taluk or a village or a district. That can be done only by the State concerned. I submit that the incorporation of the words "the district to be known as Kutch District in the new State of Bombay" is not in order. You cannot demarcate what should be called a district. It will be in the hands of the Bombay State to make its own districts and to lay down the boundaries or the limits thereof. Therefore I suggest this is not within the powers of Parliament to lay it down.

Mr. Speaker: Where is it said? In the first instance Parliament can give a name to a State or part of a State. Thereafter it is open to the State to modify it as they like. When we are forming a new State we must call it by some name. Will be he satisfied if we say "the territory known as Kutch"?

Shri U.M. Trivedi: That is not the point. Once you make a provision in a law which emanates from this Parliament saying that the old State of Kutch will be called the district of Kutch, it will override any other provision made by the State. There will be no power in the legislature of a State to make a change in the district bounderies.

Mr. Speaker: If that is the wish of Parliament, let it so stand.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: That is illegal.

Mr. Speaker: Already there are similar clauses.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: In Ajmer also there is the same difficulty. That is another illegality. Two illegalities do not make one legality.

Shri Kamath: May I request you to clarify whether the Home Minister has replied to the debation both the groups of clauses or only to clauses 2 to 15 because it is not clear to what he has replied?

Mr. Speaker: He has not replied to clauses 16 to 49.

Shri Kamath: When will he reply?

Shri V. P. Nayar: (Chirayinkil): Even in clauses 2 to 15 he has replied only to some points. We have raised so many other points, constitutional points also.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister will recollect that the main point he addressed himself to on merits was amendment 462 which necessitated this amendment to the clauses 8, 9 and 10. Now regarding other matters that were referred to here, boundary commission and so on and so forth, relating to clauses 2 to 15 and other matters relating to zones etc., in clauses 16 to 49, if he wants to reply he may do so now, or he may reply tomorrow at his convenience.

Pandit G. B. Pant: As you direct me to do.

Mr. Speaker: He may reply tomorrow.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Very well.

Clauses 71 to 114 and Schedules IV to VI.

Mr. Speaker: We will continue the debate from where we left it yesterday.

The House will resume discussion of clauses 71 to 114 and Schedules IV to VI. The time allotted was four hours and the time taken already is one hour and 35 minutes. The balance of time available for this group is two hours and 25 minutes.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): The Minister has to reply.

Shri V. P. Nayar: We also thought of crediting the time saved yesterday to the third reading.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. Minister reply now?

Shri Datar: I have no objection if the discussion is closed.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, it is closed.

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): In the course of the debate, only a few points were raised by the hon. Members.

Two questions related to Travancore-Cochin and one question related to the inconveniences caused to certain persons now practising in the Travancore-Cochin High Court. It was contended that their right to practise may not be recognised by the Madras High Court, and a point was made that just as we had a provision in respect of the Hyderabad High Court, a similar provision should be introduced so far as the advocates under the jurisdiction of the Travancore-Cochin High Court were concerned. An amendment is being considered and will be placed before the House.

The Devaswom question was considered very properly at the Government level. Hon. Member Shri A. M. Thomas had raised all these points before the Joint Committee. It was pointed out there that this question was considered by the Government of Madras as also the Government of Travancore-Cochin and then a formula was evolved, a formula that was equitable to all the parties concerned. Therefore, it will be too late in the day to go back upon what has been decided, especially when such a decision was based on equitable considerations.

Then, in respect of certain Lands belonging to Padmanabhaswami temple certain questions were raised. It might be pointed out that the questions that have been raised by Shri Nesamony and others do not exactly

[Shri Datar]

relate to the reorganisation of States. For example, certain taluks are transferred to Madras from Travancore-Cochin and there are certain questions in connection with land reforms relating to the interests of the tenants etc. All these questions though highly important have no bearing on the question of reorganisation of States. Yesterday it was pointed out by Shri Nesamony that one Ministry in the State did consider the question and the other Ministry also had taken it up but before it could consider it in detail it fell out of power and President's rule was introduced. So, this matter, though otherwise important, is not relevant so far as States reorganisation is concerned. It would be open to the President to consider all these questions. It would be also open to the Madras Government after this integration to consider how to safeguard the interests of the tenants or the occupants of these lands without affecting the rights of the Padmanabhaswami temple. It has come out that there are certain trusts. All these questions have to be considered at the State level, either by the Government of Travancore-Cochin or by the Government of Madras in respect of the territories that would be transferred to them on and from the appointed date. Therefore, all these larger questions need not be gone into at this stage, especially when various considerations were taken into account by the Joint Committee.

Then my friend raised certain questions regarding the grants that were being given to the three States. This question also was considered. The very arguments that the hon. Member Shri A. M. Thomas raised yesterday were considered and it will be found in the report that has been submitted by the Joint Committee that all these matters have been considered to the extent necessary. It will be found in the report that a recommendation has been made that the question of Kutch also should be taken into account because it was likely to suffer or be affected. The Finance Commission will take all these circumstances into account.

Lastly, it will be found that so far as the new States are concerned, they will be placed on the same footing and various provisions have been made in the chapters which we are now considering regarding the manner in which there ought to be an equitable distribution of property between the various States. It will be found that only when there are certain complicated matters and the State Governments desire that the Central Government should intervene the Central Government would do so, and the Bill has given the Central Government the right to go into all those questions and give their decisions thereon, so that all the disputes and all the complicated matters between the various States could be completely resolved.

Therefore, so far as the objections are concerned, Government are not able to agree to them, excepting in the case of one or two matters. One of them relates to the right of the advocates, and the second one relates to Kutch, to the removal of the disqualification of the advisers, so far as the new Bombay State is concerned. These are matters which would be taken into account, and amendments would be placed, so that no inconvenience or injustice is done to these people also. Subject to these two things, I would request that the Bill should remain as it is.

Shri V. P. Nayar: What has the Minister to say on clause 82 to which amendments were moved?

Shri Datar: I am not accepting any other amendment.

Shri V. P. Nayar: But the Minister has not stated the reasons for that. We want that the State undertakings which are taken over should not be denationalised.

Shri Datar: I am thankful to the hon. Member for drawing my attention to this point. He contended that when there is a transfer of certain territories, and consequently there is a transfer of certain undertakings from Travancore-Cochin State to Madras, there was the fear of certain nationalised undertakings being denationalised. That was the fear expressed by him. I suppose that was the hon. Member's point.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Precisely so.

Shri Datar: So far as this question is concerned, this again is a matter on which it would not be proper for us to make any orovisions in this Bill. The question of nationalisation has been solved or tackled in a particular way by the Travancore-Cochin Government, and it would not be proper for us, at this stage, to lay down any restrictions on the right of the Madras Government to take whatever steps they want.

After reorganisation, what happens is that these four talukas plus some more areas become a part of the Madras State, along with certain assets which they are getting and certain liabilities to which they are being subjected. Under these circumstances, it is the Madras Legislature which would be the sovereign body to consider all these matter. I would put it to this House to consider whether it would be proper on our part, on account of certain fears or certain misapprehensions expressed, to lay down a positive rule that those undertakings which have been nationalised by the Travancore-Cochin Government shall not be denationalised and shall continue to remain nationalised. That is a matter for the new State Government to tackle. I am quite confident that the enlarged State of Madras will take all these circumstances into account, especially the interest of the labour.

My hon. friend was anxious that the interests of labour should not suffer at all. This is a question on which we are all agreed. So far as the labour is concerned, so far as the employees are concerned, they have to be given very good conditions of service and necessary benefits. This is the policy which is being followed by all the States, and therefore I am quite confident that in all the areas which the Madras Government may take over, they would have before them the interest of labour, and that whenever any steps are undertaken by the Madras Government, this would be one of the most important circumstances. Ordinarily, in all such cases, the interests of labour are taken into account, and the fact that the Travancore-Cochin Government had nationalised those concerns shows, as my hon. friend has pointed out, that conditions of service or benefits are better under a nationalised undertaking than under a private undertaking. That is a principle which may be generally accepted, and the principle of such a decision should surely be taken into account. Therefore, there is no need for my hon. friend to fear that all of a sudden, after these areas are taken over by the Madras State, all that has been done by the Travancore-Cochin Government would be upset, and a new-order would be brought into being.

My submission is that in the first place, we need not attach any importance to all these misgivings. Asuming that the Madras Government have certain plans, I am quite confident that the Madras Government would take all these important circumstances into consideration and they would not make a discrimination only in regard to these transferred areas. They would consider the question of nationalisation or private effort on a larger basis on the basis of sound principles. One of the sound principles is the interests of labour. The interests of labour have always to be taken into account. That is also the policy of Government, not only at the Centre, but also in the States. So, I would

[Shri Datar]

request my hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar not to be nervous about certain rumours which must have reached his ears.

What is happening is that all these areas are going into the Madras State. And in the Madras State, as you are aware, there is a popular government. and that Government may take all the necessary precautions. And when the general elections are held, the members who are returned from these four taluks to the Madras Legislature will also give their advice to the Madras Government properly. If all these considerations are duly taken into account, I would submit to my hon. friend that he need not at this stage attempt to have any special restrictions or restrictive conditions put in this Bill. Constitutionally also, such a thing would be beyond the scope of this Bill. It would not be consequential, nor would it come under the category of the three or four other adjectives that have been used. It would not come under any of those things. It has a very remote connection with the reorganisation of States.

Therefore, I would submit that the hon. Member need not press this particular point The Madras Government so would take all these relevant circumstances into consideration, whenever they have to consider any question that relates to these undertakings.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): The Madras Government's ears are far away. So we are afraid that they may not hear, and they may act against the wishes expressed by the Minister.

Shri Datar: The Madras Government's ears cannot be for away. In fact, the people in these four taluks knew well before they asked for the transfer, that Madras is a very progressive State.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister need not answer it. The hon. Member belongs to the Madras State.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I seek one other clarification? Yesterday, a point was made that the wording of clause 82 is open to two interpretations being made on it, in respect of the location of State-owned industries. Could the Minister consider the question of changing it suitably so that only one interpretation is possible?

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): No, it is not necessary.

Shri Datar: Two or three hon. Members were doubtful as to the exact reading of the expression 'located'. So far as this expression is concerned, it does not mean the place where the head office is situated. It means the place where the work is going on, where the works are there,

Shri V. P. Nayar: If they are different places?

Shri Datar: That is the way in which this word has been used in two or three other places. Therefore, the hon. Member need not suspect that this word 'located' would have a meaning as a result of which Madras will be taken into account and not the places where these undertakings are being carried on.

Clauses 115 to 131

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the next group of clauses. I have not put any clauses so far to the vote of the House. All the other clauses will depend on those clauses which have been held over. This will be taken up tomorrow.

Now, the House will take up clauses 115 to 131 of the States Reorganisation Bill. Hon. Members who wish to move their amendments to these clauses will kindly hand over the number of their amendments specifying the clauses to which they relate, to the Secretary at the Table within 15 minutes.

I may also request hon. Members to kindly indicate the numbers of the amendments which have already been tabled, and which can fit in into the amendment moved by Government. I am asking the office....

Shri V. P. Nayar: Just now?

Mr. Speaker: Before the close of the day?

Shri V. P. Nayar: I hope you will kindly realise the practical difficulty. Among the five hundred odd amendments which have been tabled, it is not possible, unless you give us some more time, to find out which amendment can fit in with that amendment. That is the practical difficulty.

Mr. Speaker: I am not asking hon. Members to look into other people's amendments. Each hon. Member who has given amendment knows that clauses 8, 9 and 10 are rolled together. I am not asking every hon. Member to look into every other hon. Member's amendment. This may be done before the close of the day.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I have an amendment, No. 518 to clause 116. It reads:

Page 547—

after line 14, *add:*

> "Provided that when the new State is formed, all persons in the service of Government and also in quasi-Governmental institutions and local boards, shall have the minimum pay and allowances equal to the highest of the minimum pay and allowances for that class of officials in the areas which comprise the new State".

This comes after item (b) of sub-clause (5) of clause 116. This is a matter which concerns not only one State. As far as the Kerala State is concerned, Malabar and Travancore-Cochin form the new Kerala State. As far as the scales of pay of primary school teachers are concerned, according to the figures that had been given here, there is a difference between Travancore-Cochin and Madras. Also in the constituent States of the new bilingual State that is proposed, namely, Bombay, Kutch Madhya Pradesh and so no, the pay scales of primary school teachers are different. This difference is not only in respect of primary school teachers but also in the case of others.

According to the figures given, in Travancore-Cochin, a sub-inspector's pay scale is Rs. 100—5—125; in Madras, it is Rs. 80—3—85. So when the two areas are merged, the pay and allowances of government servants as well as employers of quasi-government offices and local boards, must be the minimum which is equal to the highest of the minimum pay and allowances for that class of officials in the areas which comprise the new State. Suppose the primary school teachers in Travancore-Cochin get less pay then their counterparts in Malabar. On that account, there should not be a reduction in the pay and allowances. We have found in certain cases that the pay of teachers belonging to one area is reduced to that of the other. That should not be done.

There is also another point I want to stress. There are certain other difficulties. Take, for example, the Kerala State. There is a district board in Malabar. There are no district boards in Travancore-Cochin. So, it will be either that there will also be district boards in Travancore-Cochin or there will be no district board in Malabar. Suppose they do not want

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

to have district boards and they abolish the district board in Malabar, as they would naturally do in such a case. Then the employees of the district board of Malabar should have the same status as government servants in the new State. They must be taken into the service of the new State without loss in emoluments, position and status.

I am saying this because this is a problem not confined to one State alone. In Bengal and Bihar as well as in Madhya Pradesh, Kutch and other places, there are differences. So it must be on the basis that I have suggested that the pay and allowances must be fixed. This applies to government servants, quasi-government servants and also employees of local boards. Unless this is done, those who are getting a little more pay than those in the other area will be the losers. So this provision should be made, or else in many parts of India—not only in one State—where new States are coming into being, including a bilingual State, these people will suffer. So this is a very important amendment which must be accepted.

Shri Achuthan (Crangannur): My amendment No. 517 relates to clause 113. As it is, with regard to the surplus Devaswom Fund, it is stated here that the ratio of division will be 37·5 to 13·5, 37·5 going to the Travancore-Cochin Devaswom Fund and 13.5 going to the Madras Devaswom Fund. I have no quarrel about the amount that is being given. That is a different matter. But we must stick to some principle in the division of this surplus.

You know that under the original Travancore-Cochin Devaswom Fund Act, the whole of the Hindu temples of the Travancore-Cochin area are completely vested in the Devaswom Board. The Government has practically nothing to do with it. Now in the Report of the Joint Committee, they say that an agreement has been entered into between the Governments of Madras and Travancore-Cochin. I do not know whether the Travancore-Cochin Government can interfere in this matter. This is a surplus fund which has not been spent by the Board till now.

I can appreciate if something more is to be given to Madras. That is a different matter. But how an agreement between the Governments of Madras and Travancore-Cochin is to be taken as the basis for making a provision of this kind in sub-clause 2 of clause 113, I do not know. Of course, it may be argued that the proportion must be based on this principle....

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry I overlooked one fact. Clause 113 has already been discussed and replied to. We are now on clauses 115 to 131.

Shri Datar: I replied to it earlier.

Shri Nambiar: But the reply did not refer to the point made. So he is refreshing the minds of hon. Members.

Shri Achuthan: I am sorry. I will speak on the other provisions.

Specific provisions have been incorporated in this Bill with regard to service integration. You know that in many States different sets of personnel will be coming together. Take, for instance, Kerala. From Malabar, a set of officers are coming to Travancore-Cochin. So also from four or five taluks of Travancore-Cochin, some officers are going to Madras. So, we will be faced with the problem of service integration. This is a problem not confined to one particular State but applies to the whole of India. Wherever there are, as the Speaker remarked, permutations and combinations, there will be this problem.

In our experience of the last six years after the integration of Travancore and Cochin, even though we tried our best to see that a very equitable and workable formula was arrived at in respect of integration of services of the Travancore officers and Cochin officers, even now, there is a lot of grumbling and murmering, genuine also to some extent. My apprehension is this. Even now those grievances have not been settled. We are now having a number of officers from Malabar region also coming in.

3 P.M.

Shri Kamath: Sir, there is no quorum; I have already pointed it out.

Mr. Speaker: It has been pointed out to me that there is no quorum. I just gave an aside and said that the House has set during the lunch interval when we would not mind the want of quorum and so we can overlook it. Anyhow, let us see how many are there.

Shri Nambiar: Everything is extraordinary here. Let us treat this as lunch hour.

Mr. Speaker: Let the bell be rung.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Now there is quorum and Shri Achuthan may go on.

Shri Nambiar: The Chief Whip has come; so there is quorum.

Shri Achuthan: Let us not worry about that.

Mr. Speaker: When these clauses are disposed of, we will have practically disposed of this Bill. Therefore it only remains for the hon. Minister to speak and for the House to vote—tomorrow. Therefore, hon. Members may come prepared with the other two Bills tomorrow so that they may not be taken by surprise.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Up till now no time has been allotted for the third reading.

Mr. Speaker: All hon. Members were given opportunities as much as possible.

Shri V. P. Nayar: We have not fixed up the time for the third reading; we have saved some time.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members may consider and let me know later on today.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Some time has been saved.

Shri Kamath: We have saved 4 hours.

Mr. Speaker: What I felt was that people will get tired and I will have to ring the quorum bell. Let us see.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Some changes have been made and so we must be allowed to express some of our views.

Mr. Speaker: I have no intention to shut out discussion. I only wanted to assess the feeling of the House. If the House has got an interest, I am prepared to sit for any length of time.

Shri Kamath: I may remind you of the assurance given last time that any attempt on the part of the Treasury Benches to hustle, muzzle or throttle discussion will be resisted by you.

Mr. Speaker: There is no such attempt; there will be no difficulty at all.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): There are certain amendments with regard to safeguards; amendments relating to new clauses 119A to 119F.

Mr. Speaker: Any amendment that is admissible will be allowed.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Yesterday you pointed out that certain amendments were not proper here..

Mr. Speaker: I already ruled out that they cannot be brought in here

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: That was with regard to clauses 49A etc. relating to Regional Committees. I have given notice of amendments relating to new clauses 119A to 119G.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member feels that these clauses also follow suit with the other ones, they may be moved in the other Bill. Let this discussion go on.

Shri Achuthan: Sir, I was referring to the integration of services after the reorganisation of the States. In this Bill, in clause 116 we have a provision to appoint a number of advisory bodies for the purpose of integrating the services after the reorganisation takes place. I was narrating our own experience in the case of Travancore-Cochin for the last so many years.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Even yesterday and today I have read in the papers that the low-paid officers of the Cochin area have met the Adviser and represented their grievances which have arisen as a consequence of the integration of the services. I do not say that all these grievances can be or will be remedied. That is a different matter. At least, sufficient notice might be taken of them, to see that officers of different categories and cadres are given a patient hearing. There must be a common principle to be adopted for integration throughout India and when there is integration there should be sufficient regard paid to seniority and all those questions.

For example, yesterday the hon. Minister was saying that the High Court Judges of Madras were getting Rs. 3,500 and Rs. 4,000 while for the same work done by them the Judges of the Travancore-Cochin High Court are getting only Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 2,500. When integration comes, though the same work is done by different officers, because of the difference of pay, there will arise a number of difficulties. That is the experience of the Central Government also after the integration of the Part B States of this country. Particular care must be taken to see that officers who are on the advisory bodies are mostly judicial officers with experience. That will be a good thing. Even though justice is done, we must see that steps are taken to convince people that justice is being done.

I come to another important matter; the I.A.S. and the I.P.S. After the All India Services Act was passed in 1951 and the rules came into force, that some officers from the existing State officers are recruited to I.A.S. and the Police cadre also. In our State also that was done. Unfortunately, the number of officers so recruited from our State was much less than those recruited from Mysore and other Part B States. We find that our State Government did not insist on having more officers from our State service.

Even now, in the Travancore-Cochin State there is a case pending in which the officer concerned has stated that the procedure adopted was not at all in accordance with the rules laid down. We know that the State Government has got a right to recommend. Moreover, one or two members of the Union Public Service Commission can go there and form a Board along with some senior officers of the State Government for interviewing officers and for recommending who are to be taken in the All India cadres. A specific instance was brought to my notice that in interviewing and selecting the candidates, officers who were far junior to the particular candidates who were being interviewed were taken on the Selection Board. I do not know how far justice can be meted out if such officers are taken on the Board. If in the Selection Board officers who were previously serving under the candidates who are to be interviewed are taken, will not the candidates feel that due consideration will not be given to them and they will not get their proper places? Officers who were previously serving under the candidates and who were subsequently promoted to the I. A. S. were members of the Selection Board. A case is now pending before the Travancore-Cochin High Court. The Central Government must appreciate that this is the state of affairs prevailing in those States. Because they were not able to pay higher salaries, it

[Shri Achuthan]

cannot be taken for granted that the officers of the State Governments were not efficient and were not up to the mark or that they did not know how to do things. Such assumptions are unfounded, if I may use that term.

I am of opinion that, as far as possible, the Central Government can have direct recruitment for the All India services but the senior officers of the State Government must also be given a fair chance. In the matter of interviewing and selecting candidates also, preference must be given to the senior officers who were doing the same work for the last 25 years. If you say they are unfit to be on the higher scales, then, how can we ask those people to carry on their work. In the matter of selection of State Government servants, there must be some instructions given to the officers on the Selection Boards—I do not say that special concession must be patently given—to see that some favourable considerations are given to officers in the State who have put in a service of 20 years and more in the matter of selection for I.A.S. In our State there is a general grievance—Travancore-Cochin State—that no such concession was given and only a fewer number of candidates were promoted to the I. A. S. cadre. There is indeed a genuine grievance throughout the services. If that is so, how can we persuade them to exert their utmost for the good of the country? Their grievances were represented to us, and I want that the whole matter should be sympathetically looked into. This is an occasion for the Central Government to give proper directions to see that after the reorganisation comes into being, Special Boards are appointed for interviewing candidates, who are the servants or officers of the respective States, to be taken in the All-India cadre. These are matters which have an all-India point of view and, therefore, I hope that the Central Government will pay proper attention.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: My amendment No. 450 is:

Page No. 450 is:

Page 55, *after* line 23 *insert*:

"Part XA

Safeguards to Minorities"

and this contains new clauses 119A to 119G.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: May I rise and say a word about it? These amendments relate to safeguards for minorities. I had also given amendments adding new clauses 119A to 119G relating to safeguards for linguistic minorities. Yesterday a question arose and you were pleased to point out that the proper place for it was in the other Bill, the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. Similar I think was the expression of opinion from the Speaker also. If all these amendments are to be relegated to that Bill, then they should not be allowed to be moved here. It would not be proper to allow some of these amendments to be moved here and some taken to the other Bill. Even in the Constitution Bill we have got an amendment relating to the education of boys in their mother-tongue, and that is also one of the safeguards which has been mentioned in the S.R.C. Bill Report. I submit that if one of them is taken here and the others are taken to the other Bill, it will not be proper. I would, therefore, beg of you to give a direction whether these safeguards should be discussed here and whether they should be discussed at one place. If the rulings are to be consistent, if I am not allowed to move a particular amendment with regard to a particular State, I cannot see how an amendment with regard to the whole of India can be allowed in this Bill. My amendment was not allowed to be moved yesterday in regard to Punjab State. We have to be consistent. Either all the amendments relating to these safeguards must be discussed in the other Bill or here.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy (Wandiwash): What is the other Bill?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I just want to submit that in the amendments that I am moving, there is a portion towards the end which will require a change in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. At the same time there are various other points in connection with the reorganisation of States contained in these amendments. After all, we are discussing a Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the States of India and for matters connected therewith. Arising therefrom, this is very closely connected with the question of reorganisation of States. Therefore, I would plead that in both places this matter has to come, that part of it may come in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill and part of it will have to come here. Everything cannot be moved in the Constitution Bill.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: That was exactly the objection taken in regard to my amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are certainly discussing the question of reorganisation of States and matters connected therewith, but there is no option for me even of considering this again because the hon. Speaker has already decided yesterday that these safeguards for minorities would be taken up when the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill is taken up. Therefore, as the hon. lady Member has said, if a part of her amendment relates to the protection of minorities, then everything, the whole of the amendment, would go there, and the amendments proposed to be made and having a new section inserted will all be taken up when that Bill is taken up.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Even in the S. R. C., a very important emphasis has been given to the question of safeguards for minorities. If we are to discuss the detailed working of these safeguards, especially with regard to the question of education, the question of the language to be used in the courts, the question of the language of the area and such other points, I think it will not be possible to have any such comprehensive amendment in the Constitution Bill. That is why we have considered the matter and thought it best that we should bring in a part of it which is very important and relevant here. This point has been stressed by the S. R. C. and I remember that this point was specially made by the hon. Home Minister when he introduced the S. R. Bill—the question of safeguards for minorities. I think it will not be possible to cover all these points in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. That is why I feel that substantially these amendments will have to be moved here, and only that part, which will need a change in the Constitution if we pass any of these amendments, will come in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. Otherwise, at that time, We shall be told that all these long and detailed amendments cannot be introduced in that Bill.

Shri K. K. Basu: May I make a submission, Sir? Please look at paragraph 55 of the Joint Committee Report, which categorically says certain things about the linguistic minorities:

> "The Committee gave careful thought to the question of providing adequate and effective safeguards in the Bill for linguistic minorities......"

It deals with many other suggestions. One of the suggestions was that there might be some such officer like the Scheduled Castes Commissioner or Linguistic Minorities Commissioner. There was general discussion also on that and in the Joint Committee, that point was raised by Shri Frank Anthony who stated how the safeguards have to be provided here. I think that more or less was the consensus of opinion, namely, that certain rights have to be discussed here and a statutory guarantee should be given in respect of those rights. Consequent on the rights accepted by the House, we may have to amend the Constitution and then we can introduce the necessary amendments there. But if we leave the entire thing to

[Shri K. K. Basu]

the Constitution Bill, I think it may not be absolutely pertinent or relevant to that Bill when the articles of the Constitution need to be amended so much in detail as will be done in the provisions of this Bill. I, therefore, appeal to you to reconsider your ruling.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I agree that there are certain things that overlap. There are certain matters which certainly can be discussed here, but now we have got that guidance from the hon. Speaker yesterday. On a very identical question raised by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, it has been decided by the hon. Speaker that these things would be discussed when we take up the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. There is, therefore, no question to be decided now. If the hon. Members want to refer in their speeches to these things, I will not have any objection. They might speak on those things. But so far as the actual amendments to be considered are concerned, they will certainly be taken up when the other Bill is taken up.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I wish to point out one difference. The point raised by Pandit Bhargava actually referred to a particular region, but I am at a difficulty to understand how we shall be able to move very detailed suggestions or amendments in regard to the safeguards for minorities in a Constitution Amendment Bill. At that time the House, I am sure, might say that such detailed amendments cannot be moved in a Constitution Bill. We cannot move amendments to the Constitution for such detailed matters. Therefore, I think that the right procedure would be for the House to consider the details of the safeguards for minorities in the form of amendments here, and anything which will arise out of this requiring a change in the Constitution will be embodied in the form of an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava's amendment could not be allowed here because it related to a region, there is greater reason that the general safeguards which relate to the whole country cannot be allowed here, but they will go in the Constitution Bill. But if hon. Members are very keen, I shall not decide it just now, but hear the hon. Home Minister also when he comes and then decide it. Meanwhile, the hon. Members can make their speeches and advance arguments on them subject to the decision that we may take subsequently after hearing the Home Minister as well. We can continue.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I will be moving my amendments provided it is found that they are proper afterwards.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Does it not relate to the new article 350 (A)? We have got a provision in the Bill for the amendment of the Contitution. It relates to education and other matters. This is exactly like that. This amendment deals with education in the secondary as well as primary stages. We have got an exactly similar provision in the Constitution (Amendment) Bill and it relates to that matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That discussion between Members should not now contiune. I have already asked the hon. Members to make their speeches and advance their arguments. They are subject to the decision that we may take subsequently.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: This House has debated for a sufficiently long period of time the merits and the demerits of linguistic States. I would like this House to consider one of the very important adjuncts of any linguistic State—the necessity for giving adequate safeguards to the minorities. It has often been stated here that, if there is a linguistic province, it automatically leads to the domination of one language group over the others within that State. This has arisen because of certain genuine fears and apprehensions that have been in the minds of the minorities. They have experienced various difficulties, although the Constitution has given them certain very definite safeguards. In spite of what bas been written in the Constitution, we have found that the minorities have suffered very greatly because the States, in many cases, have not acted up to the letter and spirit of the Constitution. Whenever the Centre bas been moved about it, the question of regional autonomy came in and between regional autonomy and how far the Central Government can move in this matter, the problems of the minorities have been tossed about. Their legitimate grievances have today taken the shape and form in such a way that people have begun to fear that, if there are linguistic provinces, the existence of the minorities will be in jeopardy. That is why I feel that this is a very important part of our reorganisation. It is really unfortunate that in the clauses in this Bill and the various references that have been made in the Joint Committee and elsewhere, the question of linguistic minorities has not been treated with that amount of consideration and attention that there should have been.

The Home Minister, in his first speech, spoke about the importance of safeguards for minorities. But, when it came to the actual formulating of clauses and seeing bow far and in what manner these safeguards could be brought in, they left them vague. Generous statements have been made from time to time. In the absence of any positive measure or statutory provision to achieve this purpose, I have moved this rather long amendment for the safeguard of the minorities I feel very strongly that this particular provision should be incorporated in this Bill, laying down specifically and exactly the safeguards for protecting the culture of the minorities, for the education of their children, for the recognition of their languages in areas where they exist in sufficiently large numbers. Certain Changes may be made here and there but I have tried to pinpoint certain matters which hit hard the minority communities.

First and foremost, let us take education. From our experience we can give examples of how the schools, which were teaching the children of the minority community, particularly in the border areas of various States, in their mother tongue, were discriminated against.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Abolished.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: For instance, I remember having heard from certain Members from Manbhum certain things. They had hundreds of schools there and they taught the children in their mother tongue, namely, Bengali. After sometime, we find that the grants were stopped and various indirect pressures were brought. Finally, many of them broke down and some were abolished. New schools were opened teaching in Hindi or the language of the majority community. So, there was genuine bitterness in the minds of the minority community.

It is the same thing on the other side of the border, in Assam also. I have seen things with my own eyes. Schools were started by refugees with Bengali, their mother tongue, as the medium of instruction. The authorities refused to give any grant to these schools which have been started by the minority community. After a time, they were actually pushed out of existence and they were left with no schools. These things must have happened in other States also. That is why I urge that proper attention should be given to the language of the minority community. For instance, we have heard that they were teaching in English in the Anglo-Indian schools; that was their mother tongue. But, they were unable to continue the same practice. I feel that this is something which we should guarantee. We shall certainly consider it in the amendment to the Constitution. If there is a certain percentage, if there are

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

forty children belonging to the minority group in primary schools and 100 children in high schools, the minority community shall have the right to have either separate schools or separate classes for them, whichever is possible. For the higher education also, we would like it to be specified that a college in the language of the minority group shall be provided wherever needed and practicable. These are the two points so far as education is concerned.

There is then the question of the language of the minority community. Take, for instance, Urdu in Hyderabad. Many people who have been brought up that way, who are speaking Urdu, feel rather perturbed that their language may not be safeguarded once the areas composing Hyderabad are disintegrated and merged with Andhra. That is why it is necessary for providing facilities for representation in the language of the minority communities wherever such linguistic minority forms a prescribed percentage of the population which may be 20 or 25 per cent,—the percentage can be changed—but the point is that that language should be a recognised language.

Then there is the question of judicial courts. We should also give a certain amount of recognition to these languages which we may not recognise as one of the main languages of India. I have often heard Shrimati Khongmen saying that the people who live in tribal areas feel that their languages have not been recognised even in the shcools. Facilities are not given for teaching those languages. Their scripts are not allowed to be taught. All sorts of difficulties come in the way. It is the same thing with the courts also. The peasant is very closely connected with the revenue department. So, if there is a substantial number of people of a minority linguistic group, living in an area, that area should recognise that language for judicial, revenue and other purposes. The peasant has got some connection with these and the other Government departments and he knows no language except his own. Hence this is a genuine demand that must be seriously considered.

Now, specially I would like to draw the notice of this House to the proposal which we have made, that if in any area the linguistic minority constitutes not less than 50 per cent. of the population a Minority Council should be established. We feel it is very important that these Minority Councils should be established in the States or areas where there is a very big and large minority population. In our State, for example, we have had a Minister for Minorities. We have found that only having one Minister does not do us very much good. People go to him, represent to him, he moves sometimes, sometimes he does not move, things go on mounting in the file and the whole matter is dealt within a most unsatisfactory way. That is why a Minority Council in the States, where such big minorities exist, is very important. And I would urge that this would actually give a certain amount of responsibility to the States also. The question often is raised that after all it is the State's responsibility and the Centre cannot interfere because we cannot touch the provincial autonomy. Now, although I do not entirely agree that in this case provincial autonomy will be touched to the quick and Central Government has no responsibility in the matter, I do feel that it is also important because after all, it is the States which will have, in the final analysis, to guarantee and give safeguards to the minority community. Therefore, this establishment of Minority Councils is very important and I would urge that this part of my amendment be accepted by the House.

Then again, we have also said that "there shall be established a suitable authority in the State and in the Union to report to the President regarding the representations made by the minorities". Now, Sir, as you know, in the past the minorities have found it very difficult to approach the Central Government. When the Central Government has been approached, after having approached the States again and again and having failed there, when they have come to the Centre and they have approached the Home Ministry, the Home Ministry has just pleaded incompetence and inability to interfere in the matter pleading that the States are autonomous in this matter. It is very important that some sort of arrangement should be established in the Centre. For this, Sir, it may be that we may need a constitutional change; some amendment may have to be introduced. But we feel that some sort of Minority Board should be established in the Centre so that they can actually go into these representations, go and enquire into these matters with the help of the various Minority Councils in the States, and together they will be in a position to advise the President as to what steps he should take in order to safeguard the rights of these minorities. Those reports should be placed before the Parliament and the Parliament should, from time to time, debate them as we do in the case of the report of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Commissioner.

There is also a proposal for the appointment of a Commissioner. I feel that it would be a much better thing to have a Board rather than a Commissioner, because we have felt that the Commissioner of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes has often said that he has been handicapped because (a) he has no rights, and (b) one man cannot deal with such a vast problem, even though it is only for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. In this case it will not be so specific and so narrow. The orbit of his work will be much wider. As such we feel the question of a Minority Board would be much better, because even that Minority Board would have to deal with various types of problems—problems of Tribals, problems of various communities living in the various States and multifarious other matters. That is why we would rather suggest that there should be established an authority in the form of some kind of a Board. The report of this Board should be laid before the Parliament, the Parliament should debate it and as a result of that debate the decision of the Central Government should be issued to the States concerned as a directive from the Centre which directive shall be binding on the States. That is what I feel, Sir. It is very necessary and I know that it will require certain suitable amendments in the Constitution. That is why I would urge that the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill should include within itself any such amendments which would be necessitated by this amendment for safeguarding the rights of the minorities.

Sir, without safeguarding the rights of the minorities, there is no doubt about it that there will be no peace in the minds of those who today will be forming smaller groups within the larger States, within the larger linguistic States. Even on the question of bilingual Bombay State, which is more or less a certainty now after the Congress Party has agreed to it, the minority community will have to be safeguarded. Even within the majority of the States which are linguistic States, we will have to see that these rights, which are very rightfully to be given to the minorities, have to be safeguarded. Without that we shall not be able to keep the unity of India. As we have all expressed ourselves, on the basis of linguistic States and connected closely with it the safeguarding of minorities, these twin things together will really bring about a proper re-distribution, a proper confidence and a proper unity throughout in India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker:' Certainly, I wanted to hear the hon. Minister before taking a decision, though it is a fact that a decision has already been taken when Pandit Thakur Das

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

Bhargava wanted to move his amendment. But after hearing the hon. lady Member I am now convinced that the provisions contained in these amendments can only find a place in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill and not here. The only things that the hon. Member wanted to stress were about the language of the minorities, representations against the grievances that they might have, then she wanted a Board to be set up, its report to be placed before the Parliament and to be discussed here, and action to be taken by the Centre. As she has concluded herself by saying that these require some constitutional changes, certainly, all these things can be placed there in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. They cannot have any place so far as this Reorganisation Bill is concerned.

Also, as was pointed out by our friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, there is that clause 21. That seeks to amend article 350 of the Constitution and adding 350A. Article 350 contains special directives. It says:

> "Every person shall be entitled to submit a representation for the redress of any grievance to any officer or authority of the Union or a State in any of the languages used in the Union or in the State, as the case may be."

We want that other languages also might be recognised and even smaller minorities might be able to use their own languages. These things can find a suitable place here. If the hon. Member is not satisfied with the amendment that is proposed to be brought here and discussed under clause 21, she can send in her amendments to that clause. So far as the Board, the special officer, the report that he might make and the provision for its discussion by the Parliament are concerned, there is that Chapter—Special Directives as regards certain clauses. In fact, originally, so far as I can remember—and those who have been in the Constituent Assembly must also remember—this was exactly the chapter which was meant as safeguards for the minorities. There, that word 'minorities' was omitted. Afterwards it was confined only to the Scheduled Castes and the Anglo-Indians. That Chapter is particularly meant for this purpose. If the Parliament agrees, and it is proposed to insert certain provisions as safeguards for the minorities, it is this Chapter where they can be placed and amendments moved there.

Therefore, all these amendments, if they are desired and they are permitted, could be brought in there or when ariticle 350 is proposed to be amended by clause 21 of the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. I remember perfectly well that there, origniaIly, a special officer was proposed, he had to make enquiries; submit a report to the Parliament and that report was to be discussed so far as all minorities were concerned. Then the Central Government had to issue directives or take whatever action was thought necessary. Now, I am of the opinion that these amendments cannot be discussed here. These amendments would not be allowed to be moved here. The proper place for them is the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill and all these amendments will be taken up there.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Sir, with your permission may I submit a word, not in regard to the amendment but in regard to your ruling? Sir, I appreciate your ruling. I also understand that this was decided yesterday and this was in the mind of the Speaker also when he said something to this effect but then the trouble will be this. When we want to move amendments to article 350, we will be told that as the other sections relating to representation in the cabinet, representation in the legislature and other things relating to the minorities, etc., are not mentioned in this Bill, we should not move those amendments. It may be said that these matters would come or not come under article 350A. That will be the difficulty. I am perfectly clear in my mind, after reading the report of the States Reorganisation Commission, that they have discussed everything. We are entitled to put everything either in this Bill or in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. I wish you give us a guarantee in this matter. We are debarred from considering these amendments in this Bill. My fear is that even while discussing the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, we will be met with the objection that they are only amending clause 20 of that Bill relating to article 350A of the Constitution. As the custodian of the rights of the Members of this House, you must kindly guarantee us that, either in this Bill or in the other Bill, we will have the right to move amendments relating to these items.

Yesterday also, I sought to move many amendments relating to the minorities. They are all based on the S.R.C. report, and this Bill is based on the report of the S.R.C. If, in this Bill, we are not allowed to move such amendments, please give us the guarantee that we will be allowed to move them in the course of the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. Let us not be told that these amendments are not pertinent to this Bill and also that these amendments are extraneous to article 350A in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. We want to be extricated out of this difficult position.

Shri K. K. Basu: Apart from what Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava has said, I wish to submit a few words. When we consider the zonal councils, we should also consider the interests of the minorities and see that their interests are looked after. There is some specific provision regarding the minorities, and we may provide some minority rights which may fall short of the Constitutional guarantees. There might be some code of conduct according to which the minorities should have certain rights or privileges and which may not exactly equate with the Constitutional guarantees. Therefore, in view of the fact that one of the main functions of the zonal councils relates to the rights of minorities, we are certainly competent to put in any suggestions in the Bill itself, in respect of those rights and privileges of the minorities.

As was observed by you, even at the Joint Committee meetings, we discussed this problem at length. The points were not ruled out. As a matter of fact, the Joint Committee itself made a recommendation as embodied in paragraph 55 of the report. Therefore, I would urge upon you, Sir, that while a particular form of amendment may be ruled out of order,—an amendment which may look like an amendment to the Constitution—any amendments relating to the rights and privileges of minorities may be allowed to be moved. Short of Constitutional guarantees, we may have something else which may be covered by the functions and scope of the zonal councils. So, I think you should consider this matter in the light of the remarks that I have made.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs is here. He can give us the assurance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member will appreciate that it is not possible for the Chair to give any guarantees. How can the Chair give a guarantee that such and such things could be discussed without having an occasion to consider what objections there may be regarding the amendments? It is not possible for any person sitting in the Chair here to give any guarantee for the future, saying that it will allow or not allow this and that.

Another aspect has been referred by another hon. Member, Shri K. K. Basu, saying that because the zonal councils are mentioned in this Bill and because they are being entrusted with the safeguarding of minorities, the amendments sought to be moved

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

should be allowed. I think that is not necessary. The zonal councils may have to consider those safeguards for the minorities, but, whether those safeguards are to be incorporated in this Bill or in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill is a different thing. They may be embodied in any of these Bills. Even if the zonal councils are included in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, Member have equal authority to discuss the question. Anyhow, I have given my reactions and said whatever I considered proper.

So far as the guarantees are concerned, they are for the Government to give. I shall ask the hon. Home Minister whether he can give any such assurance to the hon. Members. But that would be a different thing. The Chair cannot give any guarantee.

The hon. Minister may give his views on the matter. Since he was not here, when this matter was raised, I may give him an account of the present position. The same question which was raised yesterday has been raised again, namely, that there are certain amendments providing for safeguards to the minorities. The Speaker has expressed his opinion that they would find place in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill. But even then, there are fears in the minds of certain hon. Members that objection might be taken on the ground that only clause article 350 of the Constitution is being amended by clause 20 of the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill and that therefore, the other clauses in this Bill relating to the safeguards cannot be amended. When they want to move their amendments and press their points, they feel that this objection would be pointed out. The hon. Members want an assurance or guarantee from me which I am unable to give. They feel that they are being denied their right—whether it is their rights or their demands is a question which we need not go into—to move amendments. They say that when the opportunity comes, they might be confronted with the same position which faces them now, with the result that they may not find any opportunity to move their amendments. They want that some opportunity should be given to them, when they can move their amendments and have thest provisions incorporated either in this Bill or in the other Bill. This is what the hon. Members want.

Shri Datar: So far as the question of safeguards for the linguistic minorities is concerned, it was considered at great length in the Joint Committee. Various aspects of the matter were taken into account. I would invite the hon. Members' attention to page 11(xi) under clause paragraph 55 of the report.

A number of suggestions have been made and considered, at the Joint Committee, Shri Frank Anthony, especially, made a very powerful plea for statutory guarantees so far as the rights of minorities are concerned. A suggestion was made to the effect that there ought to be a statutory body or a judicial body or a semi-judicial body or that certain special powers should be given. A number of other suggestions were also made.

Now, there are two sides or aspects to this question. One is that the minorities are entitled to certain rights.

Shri Nambiar: We are not going into the merits of the question. We want to know whether we will have the right to move amendments, either in this Bill or in the other Bill.

Shri Datar: I have no objection to curtail my speech. I thought that the House wanted me to explain the whole position.

Shri Nambiar: Where will we get the opportunity to canvass our opinions about the safeguards to the minorities? That is the only point and the reply to it may be given now. Are we to get an opportunity for doing so and, if so, when and where?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member can have no grievance unless he has heard the hon. Minister first. Let us hear the hon. Minister.

Shri Datar: I have no objection at this stage to confine myself to the short and limited question that the hon. Member has put before the House. I shall not express the views of the Government on the merits of this problem.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have now got only that limited issue before us, namely, whether the hon. Member who wants to move his amendments can do so or not. Whatever decision the Parliament takes or whatever happens subsequently are all quite a different matter altogether. The point is whether, the hon. Member can move his amendments in this Bill or in the other Bill.

Shri Datar: This is a matter on which you have to give a ruling. It is not entirely my matter. I shall place my views before the House and also my material before the House on the basis of which you may give your ruling.

So far as the way in which we have dealt with this subject is concerned, certain suggestions were made in the report of the States Reorganisation Commission. What we have done is to include certain provisions in the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, so far as the question of schools is concerned. That subject could be discussed best at the time of the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill.

So far as the question before us is concerned, two ways have been pointed out. One is that discussion ought to take place during the discussion of this Bill, and the other is that discussion may be had while the Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill is taken up. I may also suggest a third course, namely, that the Government might issue proper instructions to the State Governments. The substance or the lines on which these safeguards would be framed and the lines on which the instructions would be given to the State Governments were placed before the Joint Committee and you would find that the instructions that the Home Ministry proposes to issue have been put in the form of a circular and printed here as Appendix A. So, there are three ways in which this question can be solved.

Shri Kamath: Why not bring a separate Bill for that purpose?

Shri Datar: We shall place it on the Table of the House in due course and it will be open to the House to decide. Of course, the Chair is not bound by what I suggest. I merely point out that Government are fully aware of the importance of this problem. They are anxious that the interests of the linguistic minors should be properly safeguarded....

Shri K. K. Basu: Not minors: they are all majors.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: "Minorities" is only the plural of "minor".

Shri Datar: They are anxious to see that the interests of the linguistic minorities are properly safeguarded. Let us confine ourselves only to this question. With due deference to the Chair, I would submit that this would not be a proper place for considering the various amendments or the points that have been raised by the hon. Members. Subject to our pointing out other ways, they might be considered in connection with the Constitution (Ninth Amenlment) Bill. Then, I would also reserve to myself the right, with your permission, to point out that instead of incorporating them either in this Bill or the other, we might incorporate them in the form of a circular which we shall issue to the various State Governments and which we promise to place on the Table of the House. Naturally, the sovereign Parliament is always entitled to discuss it and guide us properly.

Shri Frank Anthony: I want to seek a clarification from the Minister. I had put up a proposal which fell into three parts—the appointment of a Linguistic Commissioner, his reporting to Parliament and after that

[Shri Frank Anthony]

issue of directives. The Minister has accepted the third part; but, my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, had suggested that a Linguistic Commissioner should be appointed; he should report to Parliament and there should be a statutory provision. The Home Minister has said that he is accepting Dr. Lanka Sundaram's suggestion.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Yes, the Home Minister said that a Commissioner like the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes would be appointed.

Shri Datar: I said "Commissioner" and not "Commission": that stands. It has also been mentioned here:

> "It was suggested that the Government of India should, apart from utilising the good offices of the Governor in the manner recommended by the States Reorganisation Commission, take up the question of appointing a Special Officer for this purpose."

This promise is under our examination.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: We are really departing from the question at issue. We are not at all concerned with the agency now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What I am concerned with at present is the Bill before me. The hon. Minister says that it is for me to decide whether it should be taken up here or there But, it is for the Government to put what business it has before the Chair. The Chair can only deal with the Bill that is brought before It and not the other one. So far as the question whether these amendments relating to safeguards for minorities can be discussed here or not is concerned, the hon. Speaker has expressed his views and I have my views also. But, I would advise hon. Members to have patience. Tomorrow the hon. Home Minister will reply and we are not making any decisions today. When he replies, these questions might be put to him. We will have his reactions and if it is possible to incorporate them here, we can do it.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: So, we shall reserve our discussions and arguments till we hear the Home Minister's reply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes.

Dr. Rama Rao: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in view of your provisional ruling, I will not go into the details of the matter. In any case, as a firm believer on the formation of States on a linguistic basis, I want to express my anxiety for the protection of linguistic minorities.

We are particularly concerned with the question of the minorities in the Andhra Pradesh. The Urdu minority forms a very specific and influential group. I am obliged to the Urdu minority of Hyderabad for not raising any objections to the formation of the larger Andhra Pradesh, as we bad at one time feared, with justification. There was at one stage a proposal to form Hyderabad City into a separate State as an obstruction to the joining of Telangana with Andhra. Fortunately wiser counsels seemed to have prevailed with the Urdu-speaking people and I congratulate them on the progressive view they have taken to identify themselves with the larger group. As such, it is the bounden duty of those who believe in the administration of any State in the language of the people to see that the linguistic minorities are amply protected. I only want to say that these States must act in such an exemplary manner that the minorities will be more than satisfied.

I have one other small amendment—No. 492—to clause 131. This is partly to clear a vacuum that is created and secondly to propose a democratic set-up for Part C States Clause 131 deals with the repeal of the Government of Part C States Act, 1951. My amendment reads as follows:

> "after line 34, add—
>
> "(3) Notwithstanding the repeal of the Government of Part C States Act, 1951, it shall be lawful

> for the President to make an order applying to any Union Territory all or any of the provisions of that Act with such adaptations and modifications as may be specified in the order.
>
> (4) The order referred to in sub-section (3) shall remain in force until the law referred to in clause (1) of article 240 is made by Parliament and shall be deemed to be the law made under that article."

Article 240(1) refers to the democratic set-up in Part C States. I do not want to go into details, except to express my view that this amendment may be necessary to prevent a possible vacuum and for democratic set-up in Part C States.

Shri Kamath: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, after the amendment which has received the official imprimatur, some of these clauses will have to be recast, and all references to Gujarat and Maharashtra obliterated. We are handicapped to that extent; but, generally speaking, I would refer to the main provisions of this Chapter. At the outset I should invite your attention and the attention of the House to clause 118. It contains a very curious provision which only a Government which has scant regard for the processes of a Constitution-bound parliamentary democracy, could have inserted in the Bill. I need not reiterate or remind you that we are bound by the Constitution and are living in a parliamentary democracy. Now, read how this clause runs:

> "The Central Government may at any time before or after the appointed day......

—the "appointed day" is defined in clause 2 as 1st October, 1956—

> "....give such directions to any State Government as may appear to it to be necessary for the purpose of giving effect to the foregoing provisions of this Part and the State Government shall comply such directions."

I fail to understand the import of this provision.

4 P. M.

Shri V. P. Nayar: There is another Parliament going on over there.

Shri Nambiar: Under the chairmanship of the Chief Whip.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is very improper.

Shri A. M. Thomas: This is very bad.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have observed it so many times. So long as hon. Members including Minister are here, they should not turn their backs to them.

Shri Kamath: So far as I can understand this provision, the Government can implement or give effect to the provisions of the Bill long before Parliament has passed them. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not that. After the Bill is passed and becomes an Act, even though it may be before the appointed day, they can give directions.

Shri Kamath: Before or after the appointed day.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But unless this is passed into an Act how can they do so?

Shri Kamath: I will substantiate my allegation with regard to certain things happening in some States and I think they have taken place because of this provision here, either deliberately or inadvertantly. In some of the States—I am myself aware and I know from firsthand information—the Governments have appointed special departments, special officers or officers on special duty in connection with the implementation of this Act. This Government which does not know its own mind from day to day......

Shri L. N. Mishra (Darbhanga cum Bhagalpur): We know.

Shri Kamath: We know more than you do.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There should not be this side discussion.

Shri Kamath: I am not diverted or distracted by these things I concentrate my attention only on you.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would welcome such concentration.

Shri B. S. Murthy: But the concentration is very defective.

Shri Kamath: I shall not listen to that at all.

In many States the State Governments either on their own or perhaps in accordance with or in pursuance of the writ or directive issued by the Central Government have appointed officers on special duty and even created special departments and a whole cadre of officers for this purpose. Take for instance Bombay. Now, yesterday's *volte face* must have happened. in the Central Hall. Because the Home Minister referred to the Central Hall and nobody ruled him out of order though it was a party meeting—the Home Minister referred to the Central Hall and various kinds of inspiration that he got in the Central Hall—I suppose I am not also prevented from referring to the Central Hall. So, this *volte face* took place yesterday in the Central Hall or it may be earlier in the last two or three days though till the Race course meeting in Poona, there was no change. Perhaps the Race course induced some change in the mind of.....

Shri B. S. Murthy: On a point of order. Can the Central Hall be compared to the Race course at Poona?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no question of any comparison here. There is no comparison. Why did the hon. Member yield so easily?

Shri Kamath: When a point of order was raised, I thought I should yield.

I was saying that this *volte face* took place within the last two or three days, because my friend Shri Gopalan and myself were in Poona, at another spot on the some day and the Race course showed no such intention on the part of Government, and the Prime Minister there vehemently supported the centrally administered Bombay formula, and was even angry with people who had spoken against that. Today he ought to be angry with himself for having decided against that. I do not know whether he is so, but I think he ought to be.

Now, as I said, the Bombay Government, the Madhya Pradesh Government and I believe many other Governments who are going to be affected by this States Reorganisation Bill have appointed a cadre of officers, created a department and put officers on special duty, and in Madhya Pradesh the Accountant-General refused to pass certain Bills, certain pay bills submitted by the officers concerned because they had not got the necessary sanction. All this is happening because the Government has no regard for the democratic process, for any kind of established constitutional or administrative standards in this country. They have deliberately set at nought all the administrative and democratic precedents created for the good administration of the country. In the Madhya Pradesh Assembly, it is a very common phrase......

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member had brought it to the notice of Government then perhaps they might have taken action.

Shri Kamath: Parliament is supreme and I bring it to your notice rather than to the notice of the Minister. I referred one or two other matters to him nine months ago—I am not going to refer to them or say what they are—but no action has been taken. Therefore, I have lost all confidence in this Government to do anything effective.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us not stray into extraneous matters. Now we shall proceed with the Bill.

Shri Kamath: Is this extraneous? You said...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would request the Member to confine himself to the clauses before us.

Shri Kamath: The Accountant-General, Madhya Pradesh, refused to pass those pay bills. If Parliament is really sovereign and superior to the executive and really exercises all its power, I fail to see how any such thing could have been allowed to happen in the States before this Bill was passed. I know the Government is in a hurry to get many things done, but let them at least keep up appearances. Let them not flout the provisions of the Constitution. You and I and all of us are anxious, and I hope that the Government is also anxious—I do not know whether they are really so—that whatever we do here, whether multilingual, bilingual, quadri-lingual, quinqui-lingual or poly-lingual States are going to be created, we should see to it that we do not flout the provisions of the Constitution. Let us see to it that no Act is implemented before it is passed by Parliament. But that is what is happening in some States. The provisions are being implemented and expenditure has been incurred. This is a very serious matter. Public money has been wasted in implementing the provisions before they have been passed by Parliament. And nobody has been called into account. So many scandals have been exposed in Parliament. This is another scandal of a different kind, but I suppose nothing will happen. Illegal expenditure has been incurred in this Connection. It has had no sanction and yet the Government will carry on because they have a majority—majority *masti* that is the phrase often used in the Madhya Pradesh Assembly. Today they say one thing and tomorrow another. Tomorrow they may say, "The Sun rises in the West" and the whole majority will cry, "The Sun rises in the West and sets in the East". That is the kind of parliamentary democracy we are going to have in this country. I am sorry that within the brief space of six or seven years constitutional parliamentary democracy has come to this sorry pass in this country. It will not be long before a poet among us will have to write an epitaph on parliamentary democracy in this country but I hope something will intervence, some dues *ex machina* or divine intervention may take place. I have lost faith in Government to save parliamentary democracy in this country. That is one of the things to which I wanted to draw your attention.

Another matter to which I want to draw your attention is in regard to clause 116 (2), which reads thus:

> "Every person who immediately before the appointed day is serving in connection with the affairs of an existing State part of whose territories is transferred to another State by the provisions of Part II shall, as from that day, provisionally continue to serve in connection with the affairs of the principal successor State to that existing State, unless he is required by general or special order of the Central Government to serve provisionally in connection with the affairs of any other successor State."

What set-up is going to come will be announced by Government after the appointed day.

You will see another curious provision at page 54 in clause 117 (2) which reads:

> "Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent a competent authority, after the appointed day, from passing in relation to any such person any order affecting his continuance in such post or office."

With these provisions before Parliament and before the country—I believe everybody has read them in the country, and this Bill has been available to every person in the country—there is a great sense of insecurity and unrest among the officers in various States, officers not merely on the higher

[Shri Kamath]

rungs, but also on the lower rungs, such as the class IV officers, namely peons, chaprasis and so on. I suppose clause 117 and clause 116 (2) covers all officers. I do not know whether they cover officers of all categories, class I, class II and class III and class IV. Could the Minister enlighten me on this point?

Shri Datar: Tomorrow.

Shri Kamath: I suppose it covers all categories.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should not expect an immediate answer.

Shri Kamath: I thought it might help me to proceed further with my comments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The reply will come at the end.

Shri B. S. Murthy: The hon. Member is answering the question himself.

Shri Kamath: Because he could not answer, I answered it myself.

If I have interpreted these clauses correctly, I suppose they cover all the categories of officers, that is to say, all the classes of officers. Now, what is happening in some States? As I said, special departments have been created with officers on special duty, whose pay bills have been refused by the Accountant-General. Only the other day, I read a press report—I do not know whether that was correct—that a special officer has been deputed, or some officers have been deputed by the Home Ministry, from Delhi, that is, from the Centre, to certain States, not merely to partition and apportion officers, but also to partition Government files. Some of the pending files will go to Madhya Pradesh; some will go to Maharashtra—of course, now, there is no more Maharashtra, and therefore, they will go to Bombay. In Bombay, till last week, they must have apportion some files to be sent to Gujerat, some to Maharashtra and so on from today, they will again be put in a jumble. They will be brought back, I suppose, to the Bombay State headquarters. All the bundles which had been apportioned would be brought back, and those bundles would be reopened, and again, there will be a sorting out. We do not know what will happen as a result of all this 'Humble-Tumble'.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): All because of democracy.

Shri Kamath: I am glad to find that my hon. friend the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs understands democracy better than anyone of us does here. And he has shed so much light on democracy that I do not think there is any need for us to speak. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is really not an expert in Parliamentary affairs only but an expert in democracy also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may continue with the files.

Shri Kamath: I was greatly amused when I read this press report only two or three days ago. When India was partitioned, some years ago, to our misfortune,—I hope you will also agree with me—a similiar situation arose between India and Pakistan. Not, merely were offices partitioned, and officers divided, but also the files of government, some libraries, some documents etc. were partitioned. But there, the officers were given the option. They were allowed to opt for either India or Pakistan. Of course, it is not that I desire that that principle should be applied strictly and absolutely punctiliously in this case also. But I would like to know on what principle the Centre has asked the States or directed the States to partition the offices and to divide the officers. That is the moot point. Have the Central Government issued any directive to the State Governments, in this regard, or is it all being done at the sweet will and pleasure of the State Governments concerned? I am raising this point because several officers of various categories have approached me, and expressed their deep unrest, their anxiety and discontent as to what is going to happen to them. There were among them very poor officers like chaprasis and peons, class IV officers, as they are called

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They are class IV servants, not officers.

Shri Kamath: I think they are some times called class IV officers. However, I am not sure what expression has been used in this Bill. I find from clause 116 the following expression:

> "Every person who......is serving in connection with the affairs of...."

No officers is mentioned here, but only every person who is serving in connection with the affairs of the Union or State is referred to here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member had been referring to clause 117 (2).

Shri Kamath: I am referring to sub-clauses (2) and (3) of clause 16 and subclause (2) of clause 117. These are the relevant related clauses, and I am speaking on all of them together.

These clauses refer to every person who is serving in connection with the affairs of the State or Union. They do not mention about any officer. The wording is:

> "Every person who immediately—before the appointed day is serving in connection with the affairs of...".

That means that this provision covers not merely officers but also servants, that is to say, all persons serving In any capacity under Government. Are Government alive to this situation of all? Are they awake to the situation? Are they aware of what is happening in the States? In the States, all kinds of things are happening today. The Central Government are either deaf or blind, or they deliberately want to ignore these things. I am sorry to say this, but I do not know whether the Minister knows these things. Perhaps, the Minister sitting here in Delhi may not know what is happening there. Officers and government servants have come to me and complained, almost with tears in their eyes—I am not exaggerating it in any way—and they had asked me 'What is going to happen to us? We will have to go to Bombay.'

Shri B. S. Murthy: Was it at your helplessness?

Shri Kamath: It is because of your majority *masti* that we at times feel helpless. If there was not majority *masti*, and everything goes on absolutely on democratic principles, we should not have been in this situation. It is because of your majority *masti* that whatever we do here is laughed at, and not even one ear is given to us at times. The Speaker has got to tell the Minister to give us one ear at least. The Minister have not the courtesy to give us both their ears, though it is physically impossible for us to hear with one ear only. I do not know how the Minister is able to hear with one ear. But we often find it difficult to have even that one eer of the Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should be able to hold that ear fast.

Shri Kamath: If the long arm of the law were there, I would have been able to hold it fast.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I did not mean it physically.

Shri Nambiar: The hands are not long enough.

Shri Kamath: With you, Sir, in the Chair, I have nothing to say, and I have no complaint to make, and I am sure you will see to it that Ministers do attend to debates and do take down notes of whatever points they should.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Is all this to be taken down?

Shri Kamath: The Minister knows I hope what is to be taken down, and what not. My hon. friend Shri A. M. Thomas need not enlighten him.

I was saying that poor servants who are getting a pay of less than Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 a month—you know how much the chaprasis are getting, they get a pay of only Rs. 30 or Rs. 40 with some allowances—came to me and said, 'We are being told to pack up and go to Maharashtra. Some of us have been told to go to Jabbalpur, some of us to Indore, and some to Gwalior and so on.' I am sure, some of them must have been asked to go to Bombay or Hyderabad also. My hon. friend, the Parliamentary Secretary for External Affairs is sitting there, and he is nodding his had. I am sure must be aware of similar things in his own State.

Now, Bombay will provide a very interesting problem. Some of them may have been told to go to Maharashtra, some may have been old to go to Gujarat. Perhaps, they might have already made some arrangements with their relations, or they might have hired some little huts and hovels—Government cannot provide anything better. So they must have hired huts and hovels in their new States. They might have paid some *pugree* also. This *pugree*, though out of currency here, is prevalent in Bombay. Over and above the rent, the landlord demands a lump sum of Rs. 1,000, or so, for letting out a quarter. That is called *pugree* in Bombay.

An Hon. Member: Here also.

Shri Kamath: These servants might have paid Rs. 500 or Rs. 1,000 as *pugree* because in three or four months, they cannot otherwise arrange for their houses. If tomorrow, they are asked to go to Gujarat or Bhopal or Gwalior, they cannot find accommodation, unlike Ministers who have bungalows at their disposal. I am told in Bhopal because of lack of accommodation, all the officers have been told that they will have no houses and they will have to live in tents. I do not know how many tents will be pitched in Bhopal. It might have the sort of appearance of a beleaguered city. There might be two officers put in one tent. One officer of my State—I met him in the train some days ago; he was a police officer—said, 'we do not know....

Shri Kamath: May I submit that Member is going into too much detail.

Shri Kamath: That is the only way of driving the point home.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Whether two officers would be huddled together in one tent and all that need not be discussed. We ought to proceed with the amendment that the hon. Member has.

Shri Kamath: May I submit that is relevant in the light of clause 118 where it is said that the Central Government shall give directive to the State Governments?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has referred to these directives. To ask whether everything is known to Government, and to say that officers would be put to certain difficulties and discomforts is all right. But to go into details and say that two or more people would be put in one tent is unnecessary.

Shri Kamath: You have put it very mildly that there may be certain discomforts and all that. But that is not enough. I speak in this fashion because otherwise I feel it is difficult to drive the point home to the hide-bound Minister....

Shri B. S. Murthy: Let him put it blindly.

Shri Kamath:....not ordinary hide, but the rhinoceros hide-bound Government It is only by such illustrations that you can hammer the point home. Otherwise, they will never make any impression on them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is he satisfied will all those adjectives he has used?

Shri Kamath: I will judge tomorrow whether I am satisfied or not.

Now, I will finish. I understand that about six hours are allotted for this group of clauses.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But not all that for the hon. Member.

Shri Kamath: If more time had been allotted. I would have spoken......

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am told four hours have been allotted for the third reading.

Shri Kamath: But we cannot intrude and steal part of that. I am constrained to say that last week when this Bill was discussed....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member shall have full opportunity to speak.

Shri Kamath: I am speaking for my colleagues also. I am not selfish.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He need not plead for his colleagues. They have their own grievances.

Shri Kamath: In the case of a Bill of this nature, I hope—and the Speaker assured us—that there would not be any hustling, muzzling or throttling of any kind. I hope that assurance will be given effect to. Now, suddenly some bright idea has dawned in the Treasury Benches. I am sure you will sternly discountenance such attempts as throttling, muzzling and hustling.

I would like to know from the Minister what directives they have issued to the State Governments on this subject, particularly with regard to Bombay and the big State of Madhya Pradesh that are going to come into being. Madhya Pradesh is going to be the biggest State in area. Reference to integration is made in clause 116, as follows:

> "the division and integration of the services among the new States and the States of Andhra Pradesh and Madras".

Madhya Pradesh will have in it Part A, Part B and Part C—all three will be merged into one. This will present the biggest problem with regard to integration of services and also with regard to provision of accommodation and other ordinary amenities to the officers and servants who will be posted to various divisional or provincial headquarters in this new State.

There was some reference some days ago in the Press that there would be four or five Benches—permanent Benches—of the High Court in this big State. This might rob the High Court of its importance. I should have spoken yesterday about this matter, but I was called away yesterday. So I am making only a passing reference to that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That deficiency might not be made up today.

Shri Kamath: This is only by way of a passing reference. I would, therefore, earnestly request the Minister to tell us even now something with regard to the partition of files, partition of officers and so on. Partition of officers and chaprasis has been done in many States and the formalities have been completed. They have been told to go. They have been given no option. Imagine a Marathi-speaking chaprasi being ordered—because under clause 117(2) Government are authorised to do so—to go to Gwalior or Indore or Rewa. Is it fair, I ask? It is all right for Ministers to say, 'India is one'. We understand it. Ministers need not tell us that. We know it perfectly, even better than some Ministers do. But the point is, what is the poor chaprasi going to do when suddenly he is transferred to a new place. He has no house there. He may be drawing Rs. 50. There may be others, clerks and so on, who may be drawing Rs. 75 or Rs. 100 or Rs. 150. What will they do? I say this is one of the grossest injustices being perpetrated by this Government.

[Shri Kamath]

I hope that some sort of consideration, if not safeguards, will be given with regard to their future posting and apportionment between the various States. I hope that Government will consider this very seriously and issue definit directives as to how the States concerned should behave in this matter. Some sort of option should be given to these officers and servants of all categories.

I have heard some instances that because an officer does not like one of his subordinates, he has been told to go to a place which is adverse to him, outside his language area, and that sort of thing. These things must not happen and this Parliament must see that these things do not happen. I hope Government will seriously consider this matter.

There is one amendment moved by Shri A. K. Gopalan which stands in my name also. I support that amendment, No. 518. It refers to the minimum pay and allowances of government servants, quasi government servants and employees of local boards. I hope the Central Government will see to it that wherever these officers are transferred, they will enjoy the maximum pay and allowances which that class of officials get in any part of that new State. In Madhya Pradesh itself, there will be government servants who now get less pay. In Vindhya Pradesh or in Bhopal, they get less pay than their counterparts in the present Madhya Pradesh. So after the new States come into being, the same kind of officers must get the maximum pay and allowances under that category in any constituent part of the new State.

Lastly, I would refer to clause 130. I am sorry, because I had to go to Poona last week, I could not table an amendment. But I would request the Minister to accept the formula, more or less the now standardised formula, with regard to such matters. We have done it in the case of the Citizenship Bill and several other Bills which have been passed by Parliament recently. This is with regard to rule-making power. I say that under sub-clause (2) of clause 130, the rules should be laid before Parliament for a period of 30 days or two or three weeks—I think for 3 weeks at least—and shall be subject to such modifications as Parliament may make. If I am allowed, I will now move that amendment orally. The Minister's senior colleague accepted this in the meeting of the Joint Committee on the Citizenship Bill without any argument. He said that it was right because we want to make Parliament supreme. I believe his junior colleague will also endorse this sentiment that Parliament's authority should not be curbed in this matter in any respect and the rules should be laid before Parliament and shall be subject to such modifications as Parliament may make within a specified period.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am speaking in support of amendment No. 518. I would not have spoken on this amendment had it not been for the Minister's observations in reply to some of the points which I raised this morning. In reply to the point which I raised about the industrial or commercial undertakings which go from one State to another, although the Minister said that he was confident that the popular Government in a State like Madras will look to the interests of labour, he was very reluctant to have a statutory provision incorporated. It means that it was not possible for Government to accept the amendment even on principle.

Now, the question is this, whether the Government which feels reluctant to have a provision by which nationalised industry which goes from one State to another should continue to be a nationalised industry, will not also say that it is open to the State Government in regard to the service conditions of officers who are transferred from one State to another, to determine those service conditions, unless we provide specifically for the guarantees or safeguards for the services. We have also to see what we have been doing in the matter of the service personnel of various States. You know that although there is no provision as such in the Constitution under which equal work will get equal pay, there is this vague suggestion—and in the Directive Principles you will find article 38—saying that the State shall strive to promote the welfare of the people by securing and protecting as effectively as it may a social order in which justice, social, economic and political etc.

So, I submit that when certain officers of a State go to another State, it will only be in the interests of economic justice that the same class of officers should get the same pay. This question will be understood better if we go through the pay-scales now in force in the various States. My hon. leader, comrade Gopalan, pointed out one instance. I have here several instances of the discrepancies and differences in the pay-scales especially of the lower categories of staff in the various Governments. I do not want to tire the House with all the details but I would submit this to you I am sorry I can illustrate my point only by quoting examples from Travancore-Cochin, Madras and Mysore because in this area there is bound to be a certain re-adjustment when officers from one State will go to the other.

I find on certain information gathered by the Research and Reference Branch of our Secretariat that a Police Inspector, for example, in Travancore-Cochin gets according to the Budget Estimates Volumes I and II of 1956-57—I think they will be latest also—a Sub-Inspector in Travancore-Cochin at present draws pay on a scale of Rs. 100-5-125-7½-200. Similarly, a Head Constable in Travancore-Cochin, of the first grade, is on the scale of Rs. 60-3-75. A Head Constable of the second grade gets Rs. 50-2-60 and a Constable second grade gets Rs. 35-1-40. Why my amendment is necessary is that we must ensure that this is made available to the police constables, the Head Constables and the Sub-Inspectors who may be transferred from the present Madras State to the future State of Kerala or from the present Mysore State to the future State of Kerala. I find that as against the Sub-Inspectors' grade of Rs. 100-200 in Travancore-Cochin, the Sub-Inspector in Mysore today is only on a scale of Rs. 70-150 and in Madras on a scale of Rs. 80-3-95-4-115-5-135-5-150. They should both have the same grade. Similarly, for Head Constables in Mysore, it is Rs. 50 and in Madras it is 40-1-50. In the case of Constables also there is a difference in pay. I submit that after integration, this question will arise. Unless we accept an amendment like this, what will be the position of the police constable, who today works under the Madras Government, when he goes over to take his duty in some place in Kerala? I submit that there should be no difference in pay for the same class of officers.

Yesterday I heard the hon. Home Minister speaking in sympathy with the High Court Judges in the matter of equalising the pay of the various High Court Judges. Though no provision could be made, from what I gathered and if I understood him correctly, he was favourable to have the same pay for all the High Court Judges. It does not matter at all for a High Court Judge who already gets Rs. 1,500 or Rs. 2,000 if his pay should be raised to Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000. Justice is not dependent upon the standard of the salaries received by Judges. But it very much matters to a police constable, a primary school teacher or a clerk and to all the lowly paid officers, who, on transfer to a new State, find that, though identical work is being done by those who had the good fortune to enter the service of the State earlier, they are having better scales. If it were only in one department, I would not have tabled this amendment. I find that even in the case of primary school teachers this difference exists. I am giving

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

only one or two examples to clinch the issue. A third division clerk, for example, in Travancore-Cochin is paid on a scale of Rs. 40-3-55-5-75-EB-5-120. What is the position in Madras? In Madras the same man, the same quill-driver, the man who ekes his sustenance through the quill is only on a pay of Rs. 45—90. And, in Mysore, it is worse. Today a third division clerk in Mysore is only on the scale of Rs. 40--80. My amendment seeks that if on redistribution a clerk from Madras goes to Travancore, the future Kerala, if he is getting pay on the 45—90 scale, be must be placed in the scale which will enable him to go up to Rs. 120. Or, on the other hand, if a Mysore man goes to Madras, he must not continue to get Rs. 40--80 but he must go to the extent to which the Madras clerk goes today.

In the case of peons also there is a difference. I am very sorry that in spite of this suggestion in the Constitution that Government will strive--these are the words used—'the Government shall strive to promote the welfare of the people' by securing economic justice, there is this difference. Where is economic justice when, in Travancore-Cochin or Mysore or Madras, in towns having almost the same working class cost of living index, a chaprasi attending on his superior officer all the 24 hours of the day gets Rs. 20 in one place and Rs. 25 in another place? After some time both these will serve under the same Government. If there is this disparity, then it is not a matter for the States to decide. The States will not decide; their past is indicative that such action will never be taken. We know the problems which were created in Travancore-Cochin for example. In 1951 the services of the erstwhile Cochin State and the Travancore State were integrated and the problem still remains unsolved, especially for the lower grades. My hon. friend, Shri Iyyunni, repeatedly claimed that the Cochinites were not favourably treated, but we have also heard the other side......

Shri C. R. Iyyunni (Trichur): I said that they were not justly treated.

Shri V. P. Nayar: There is also another case equally weighty, and perhaps more, that consequent on the integration of the erstwhile Cochin services, in the categorisation or the equation of the posts, the weightages given to Cochin services have not been done on a justiciable basis. I do not want to say anything more. The result is that even today the details of the integration of the Travancore-Cochin State have not been finalised, because during the time of integration there was no provision which made it mandatory on the successor government, as it were, to resort to certain fundamental rules. This position, in respect of States, is bound to linger for a very long time unless here and now we give a directive in the manner I have suggested in my amendment to see that in every State, when a section of officers come from one State and go to the successor State or to the neighbouring State, there shall be a uniform principle for the whole of India, and more so as the Constitution says that the States shall strive to give economic justice.

My hon. friend, the Home Minister, must bear in mind that in a few days the heat which is generated in this House will disappear, but unless you have certain provisions here, millions of people are going to be affected. They will have a heart-burning. It is a fact that the Chief Secretary going from Maharashtra to Bombay will not at all be worried about his pay; but we know that in such cases he will always get the benefit of the higher pay.

Yesterday, I remember the hon. Minister spoke with some sympathy and told the House that I have been constantly agitating for a better pay for officers, the work of whom is now being done by the greater-paid I.A.S. and I.P.S. officers. What have we done for that? Whatever may be the justification which the hon. Minister can now give, whatever may be the argument by which he will say that to maintain an all-India cadre of services, certain special advantages have to be given, is it not really ridiculous that in one room an Under Secretary of State Service, who has had an equally brilliant academic career but did not have the good fortune to get into the Service—I am not referring to the I.A.S. officers who get in by direct recruitment—is getting far lower pay? We know especially from our State what *golmal* has been there in the matter of selection.

An Hon. Member: What does it mean?

Shri V. P. Nayar: It is a common word in Delhi.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Something not straight.

Shri V. P. Nayar: We know how the selections have been made. The Governments were not having any voice; their representatives sat on the Boards only as observers. I do not propose to go into those details.

Today what is the position? A man who is an Under Secretary working in room No. 37 in Travancore Cochin, or for that matter, Madras, gets Rs. 200 to Rs. 300, while a man working in room No. 38, who has had the good fortune to enter the I.A.S. on the results of the competitive examination is placed on a scale of Rs. 800 to Rs. 1,200. If one man is in charge of P.W. section, the other man in the I.A.S. cadre is in charge of the judicial section; the same type of reference on files comes, the same number of files are attended to and the same powers are being exercised. An Under Secretary may have the power to close a file by himself. All these things are the same. There is no additional responsibility on the part of the I.A.S. officer, but in order to maintain the prestige of an all-India service, for doing identical work, you pay very much more, double and treble, to the I.A.S. officer. The hon. Home Minister is not worried about it; he says that it has to be maintained. I want his sympathy to be extended to the case of these underdogs as well. My friend, Shri Kamath was giving some details how the class IV staff are experiencing difficulties on account of transfer from one State to a successor State. I do not want to go into all those details now but merely say that at least in the lower categories there must be a uniform scale of pay in all places. It is not because that these class IV people wanted the States to be reorganised in such a way that they will have to go from one State to another that we are having it; we are having the reorganisation on different grounds. It is not either their virtue or their fault. They have now to take stock of the circumstances. What are they to do? Are they to be told that because they entered service in Madras for Rs. 20 or Rs. 30 as a police constable in grade II, they shall be entitled only for that? When a Madras police constable is attached to an Ernakulam police station, he gets Rs. 25 as a constable. It happens *vice versa* also. There are several cases where corresponding jobs in Madras have a higher pay. The possible argument which the Home Minister may resort to, I am anticipating him because I have known him so well that I think this will be the only argument that he will bring forward, is that being a service matter, relating to the service of a State and not being a Central subject, this House should not propose it or pass it. I submit that that argument should be completely ruled out in this case because we are redistributing the territories consequent on which certain service conditions are changing, the attachment of certain officer's to certain Governments will be changing, the circumstances under which the officers, class I, II, III and IV, will be working will also be changing on account of certain factors for which these officers are not responsible. I plead that the Home Minister must very seriously consider the amendment which I have proposed. If he says that my amendment cannot be accepted, I can only say that he is not very much sympathetic to ensuring what is already suggested in the Constitution, what is very desirable, and what in

[Shri V. P. Nayar]

the interests of justice the underdogs espacially are entitled to expect from a government.

I would also suggest that there is another possibility. I am speaking about this with a certain knowledge of what has happened in the past. Certain States before integration had grades fixed for various jobs. I will not refer to any States because it will create unnecessary wrangle in this House also. State X knew that State X will be amalgamated with State Y. In State X the authorities concerned passed an order one fine morning saying that all posts from Rs. 40 to Rs. 70. are revised to Rs. 50 to Rs. 100. It has happened that the other State did not know what it was or why it was so. After wards there is the integration. You will find that the weightage for past service will not be the determining factor. Posts are being equated on the basis of pay drawn at the time of integration. If on the 15th March the States are integrated, the authority takes into account what the particular officer, clerk or subordinate was drawing on the 1st March. It is not taken six months from behind. It will happen in the higher grades also because no superior officer under any Government is interested in providing some facilities for the poorer sections of the officials. It will happen that certain officer will get the advantage and the pay scales will be so revised. I want the hon. Minister to consider this possibility also and to have a uniform rule: a particular date to determine seniority, weightage of service, educational qualifications etc. Based on these, there should be a uniform principle in the matter of equation of posts and categorisation subsequent to integration.

I have not thought of giving an amendment on this point because I think it is rather difficult for me. I do not have the assistance of a Ministry to draft an amendment to go into these details. But, I request the Minister to go into this question and suggest a suitable amendment by which we can apply the same set of principles in the matter of service. Problems are bound to occur not in their hundreds or thousands but in ten thousands consequent on the reorganisation of States. I once again request the hon. Minister not to treat this amendment as an amendment from the opposition.

It may be asked: what is the power of Parliament to determine the conditions of quasi-government employees and local bodies' employees? It was only this morning that the Speaker ruled that we have power to pass any law if it does not violate the Constitution. This does not violate the Constitution. I have deliberately included the word in my amendment, the word 'quasi-Government'. The service conditions and other matters relating to the staff of such bodies are to a large extent being controlled by local legislatures. In my State we have got the District Municipalities Act and Government there has power to do anything with regard to these matters. It is not as if it is specifically mentioned that the State Government has power to lay down the service conditions. But, by and large, we find that the service conditions are identical in the local boards, in panchayats and in district boards. Therefore, I have included the word 'quasi-Government' also apart from Governmental institutions and local boards so that they can all come within the scope of this amendment. Integration will not, then, leave any one with heart-burning. A person who is low-paid and in the service of such bodies should not have a feeling that the integration of States has in any way affected him adversely. He should also feel that it is a matter for him also to rejoice. I, therefore, once again appeal to the Minister to consider the merits of my amendment and accept it.

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी (कुष्टगी) : मैं सर्विसिज (सेवाओं) के बारे में चन्द बातें इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूं। जैसा कि आप जानते हैं सर्विसिज के बारे में खसूसन दो बातों का हमें जरूर ख्याल रखना चाहिये।

पहली बात तो यह है कि जब कोई अफ़सर या नौकर, जो कि सरकार के तहत काम करता है, किसी दूसरी स्टेट में जाये, तो उसकी सीनियॉरिटी (वृष्ठता) पर किसी किस्म का इफ़ैक्ट (प्रभाव) न हो। दूसरी बात यह है कि उन लोगों के पे-स्केल्ज (वेतन क्रम) में यूनिफ़ामिटी (एक रूपता) लाने कि व्यवस्था की जायें और यह कार्य स्टेट्स के हाथ में न छोड़ा जाये। इस सम्बन्ध में अगर मैं अपनी स्टेट का उदाहरण दूं, तो कोई यह न समझे कि मैं किसी इन्डीविजुअल स्टेट (एक राज्य) की ग्रीवेन्स (शिकायत) पेश कर रहा हूं। हर एक स्टेट में इस तरह की ग्रीवेन्सेज हो सकती हैं। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि उन को दृष्टी में रख कर उन सब को जेनरेलाइज (समान्यीकरण) कर के हम एक डायरेक्टिव (निदेश) इस बिल में शरीक कर सकते हैं जिस के द्वारा हम तमाम अफ़सरों और सरकारी नौकरों को न्याय-दान दे सकते हैं।

मैसूर स्टेट में जो कुछ हो रहा है, उस की तरफ मैं ने होम मिनिस्टर साहब को तवज्जह दिलाई थी और उन्होंने भी उस बारे में बहुत से रिप्रेजेन्टेशन्ज (अभ्यावेदन) देखे होंगे। नई मैसूर स्टेट में हैदराबाद, मद्रास, बम्बई और कुर्ग के कई हिस्से शामिल किए जा रहे हैं। मैसूर स्वयं एक ऐसा यूनिट है, जिस का कोई हिस्सा उससे बाहर नहीं जा रहा है। हाल ही में मैसूर में क्या कार्यवाही की गई है, उस के विषय में मैं, जनाबे वाला, आप का और इस सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं। वहां पर मैसूर के मुख्य मंत्री ने या उन को छोड़ दीजिए, मैसूर गवर्नमेंट ने तीन चार सौ गजेटिड पोस्ट्स (गजटकृत पद) की क्रीएशन की एनाउन्समेंट (घोषणा) की। देखा गया है कि उन में एक आदमी पहले महीने तहसीलदार बनता है, दूसरे महीने डिप्टी कलेक्टर बन जाता है और तीसरे महीने कलेक्टर बन जाता है। इस प्रकार से वहां प्रोमोशन्ज (पदोन्नति) और हायर ग्रेड्ज (उच्च क्रम) देने की कोशिश की जा रही है और यह सब कुछ किया जा रहा है खास तौर से 'at the cost of the other officers who are joining that territory'. इस बारे में हैदराबाद में एक कान्फ्रेंस हुई थी वहां के होम मिनिस्टर के तहत। वहां पर जो रेजोल्यूशन्ज (संकल्प) पास किए गये थे, वे माननीय मंत्री के सामने होंगे। मैं दरख्वास्त करता हूं कि गवर्नमेंट जरा उनका ध्यान रखे। जैसा कि तमाम लोगों को मालूम है, मैसूर में पे-स्केल्ज (वेतन क्रम) बहुत ही कम हैं। स्कूल टीचर्ज, पुलिसमैन और पुलिस आफ़िसर्ज की तनख्वाहें बहुत कम हैं। एक पुलिस सब-इंस्पैक्टर को ७० रुपये मिलते हैं, जब कि हैदराबाद में उस को १०० से १२० रुपये तक मिलते हैं और मद्रास और बम्बई में १५० तक मिलते हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि यह जो डिसपैरिटी (असमानता) है, इस को दूर किया जाना चाहिये और सर्विसिज के डिफ़रेंसिज (अन्तर) को खत्म कर के ईक्वलाइजेशन (समानीकरण) किया जाना चाहिये। मेरा सजेशन (सुझाव) यह है कि जो गजेटिड आफ़िसर (गजटकृत पदाधिकारी) दूसरी स्टेट में जाये, तो उस के लिए कम से कम पे-स्केल को स्टैंडर्ड (प्रामाणिक) माना जाये और उस को वही दिया जाये, लेकिन जब कोई नान-गजेटिड गवर्नमेंट सर्वेन्ट दूसरी स्टेट में जाता है, तो उस को दोनों में से ज्यादा ऊंचे पे-स्केल को मन्जूर किया जाय। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि गजेटिड आफिसर को दोनों स्टेट्स के पे-स्केल्ज में से कम पे-स्केल दिया जाये और नान-गजेटिड स्टाफ (न-गजिटकृत कर्मचारी) को दोनों स्टेट्स के ग्रेड्ज में जो ऊंचा हो, वह दिया जाये। मिसाल के तौर पर मैसूर में गजेटिड और नान-गजेटिड दोनों तरह के स्टाफ़ की तन्खवाह कम है, जब कि हमारे वहां वे ज्यादा तन्ख्वाह पाते हैं। हमारा जो गजेटिड स्टाफ़ यहां जाय, अगर उस के ग्रेड को कम कर के ईक्वलाइजेशन हो सकता है, तो वह कम कर दिया जाये, लेकिन नान-गजेटिड स्टाफ़ के मामले में वहां के ग्रेड्ज को ऊंचा किया जाये और इस तरह यूनि-

[श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी]

फ़ार्मिटी (एक रूपता) पैदा कर दी जाये। मैं यहां चाहता हूं कि एपाइन्टिड डे (निश्चित दिन) के बजाय उस दिन से अब स्टाफ़ की सीनियारिटी मानी जाये, जब कि एस० आर० सी० (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) रिपोर्ट पबलिश (प्रकाशित) की गई थी, या जिस दिन गवर्नमेंट ने उसको एकसेप्ट (स्वीकार) कर लिया या जिस दिन गवर्नमेंट ने यहां पर बिल इन्ट्रोड्यूस (पुरःस्थापित) किया। नई स्टेट्स के एग्जिस्टेंस (निर्माण) में आने के दिन को इस बारे में मुकर्रर नहीं किया जाना चाहिये। अगर ऐसा न किया गया, तो, सीन्स के पीछे आज जो बहुत कुछ गोल-माल हो रहा है, उस की वजह से बहुत से अफ़सरों के साथ अन्याय होगा। उस को रोकने के लिए मैं यह सजेस्चन देना चाहता हूं कि एपायंटिड डे को कुछ दिन और पीछे ले जाया जाय। इस तरह कुछ न्याय हो सकेगा।

इस के बाद में क्लाज़ १२६ पर दिए गये अपने संशोधन ४८६ पर आता हूं, जोकि इस प्रकार है:

पेज (पृष्ठ) ५८ पर, लाइन (पंक्ति) २० के बाद यह जोड़ दिया जाय—

"(2) The President may by order do appoint an ex-judge or judges to settle the boundary disputes referred to him by States concerned within a year after the appointed day."

5 P.M.

इस बिल को इम्प्लीमेंट (लागू) करने में जो मुश्किलात पेश आवें उन को दूर करने के लिये हम क्लाज़ १२६ में प्रेसीडेंट (राष्ट्रपति) को पावर्स (शक्तियां) दे रहे हैं। इस सिलसिले में हमारे सामने एक बहुत बड़ा प्राब्लम (समस्या) माइनारिटीज़ (अल्प संख्यक) का और बाउंडरी डिस्प्यूट्स (सीमा विवाद) का आवेगा। माइनारिटीज़ के सवाल पर यहां काफी बहस हो चुकी है। मेरा मकसद यह है कि माइनारिटीज़ को कम से कम रखा जाये। इस सवाल को आप को नान-पार्टी लाइन्स (बिना दलीय आधार) पर सोचना चाहिये। पन्त जी ने कहा था कि अगर कोई सजेस्चन अपोज़ीशन (विरोधी दल) की तरफ से भी नेशनल प्वाइंट आफ व्यू (राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण) से आवेगा तो उस को हम मान लेंगे। इसलिये मैं अपने अमेंडमेंट (संशोधन) की मंजूरी के लिये गवर्नमेंट से अपील करता हूं। आप इस बिल को कबूल कर लेंगे और नेसेसरी अमेंडमेंट्स को भी इस में शामिल कर लेंगे। जब यह बिल सिलेक्ट कमेटी (प्रवर समिति) को गया था तो इस में बाउंडरी कमीशन (सीमा आयोग) का प्रावीजन (उपबन्ध) था। अब आप कुछ आथारिटी जोनल काउंसिल्स को दे रहे हैं, लेकिन इस में बाउंडरी डिस्प्यूट्स को तै करने के लिये कोई प्रावीजन नहीं है। इसीलिये मैं ने यह अमेंडमेंट पेश किया है ताकि प्रेसीडेंट को इन दिक्कतों को दूर करने की पावर मिल जाये। और मैं ने इस को कम्पल्सरी (अनिवार्य) भी नहीं रखा है। अगर आप इस को मान लें तो आप को कोई दिक्कत नहीं होगी। मैं ने इस में शब्द "मे" (सकना) का इस्तेमाल किया है, "शैल" (करेगा) का इस्तेमाल नहीं किया है। आयन्दा बार्डर एरियाज़ (सीमा क्षेत्रों) में झगड़े हो सकते हैं। कर्नाटक के बारे में मैं ने आप को कुछ उदाहरण उस रोज़ दिये भी थे, जैसे कि मड़कसिरा में हमारी भाषा बोलने वाले ६४ परसेंट हैं लेकिन उन को हम से नहीं मिलाया गया क्योंकि कमीशन की राय में यह कम से कम ७० परसेंट होने चाहिये तब वह इलाका मिलाया जाता। इसी तरह के दूसरे इलाके हमारे प्रान्त में भी हैं जिन को दूसरे प्रान्तों में मिलाया जाना चाहिये। इन झगड़ों को दूर करने के लिये प्रेसीडेंट जजों को एपाइंट कर सकते हैं। बल्लारी में इस तरह का झगड़ा था। जजेज़ ने उस मामले की तमाम तफ्सील आप को दे दी और उस को स्वीकार करने में आप को कोई तकलीफ नहीं हुई। महाराष्ट्र

आन्ध्र और कर्नाटक आदि के लिये जो प्रिंसिपल्स (सिद्धान्त) रखे गये हैं उन से भी मैं आप को बाइंड नहीं करना चाहता । प्रेसीडेंट गवर्नमेंट की एडवाइस (परामर्श) पर अपनी आथारिटी (प्राधिकार) एक्सरसाइज (प्रयोग) करते हैं । जो भी सलाह सरकार उन को देगी उसी के मुताबिक वे आथारिटी एक्सरसाइज करेंगे ? अगर किसी जगह इस तरह के बार्डर के झगड़े हों तो उन के बारे में गवर्नमेंट प्रेसीडेंट को उन झगड़ों को जजों को रेफर करने की सलाह दे सकती है जैसाकि बल्लारी के मामले में किया गया । मैं ने अपने अमेंडमेंट में रखा है कि इस तरह की सारी डिस्प्यूट्स एक साल के अन्दर जजेज को रेफर कर दी जायें । यह भी हो सकता है कि कोई इंडीवीजुअल (व्यक्ति) या एसोसियेशन (संस्था) इर्रेसपांसिबिल (अनुत्तरदायी) तरीके से मांग करे । कुछ झगड़े गवर्नमेंट लेविल पर भी पैदा हो सकते हैं । इसलिये मैं चाहता हूं कि इन झगड़ों को तै करने के लिये कोई रेसपांसिब्बिल बाडी (उत्तरदायी निकाय) मुकर्रर की जाये । मेरे खयाल से इस तरीके से बहुत कुछ तकालीफ दूर हो जायेंगी । जब पीसफुल एटमासफियर (शांत वातावरण) हो जाये और स्टेट्स अपने डेवलपमेन्ट (विकास) में लगें, उस वक्त अगर कोई इस तरह का मामला स्टेट्स प्रेसीडेंट को रेफर करें तो उन झगड़ों को तै करने के लिये मैं प्रेसीडेंट को पावर देना चाहता हूं ताकि वे तकालीफ दूर हों । जहां ठीक समझें वहां पर आप जजों को एपाइंट करें । इसलिये मैं ने शब्द "मे" रखा है, "शैल" नहीं रखा । मैं सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट से प्रार्थना करता हूं कि बार्डर डिस्प्यूट्स के लिये जो मैं ने अमेंडमेंट दिया है उस को मंजूर कर लें । मैं मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वे इस विषय पर पंत जी से या कैबिनेट से सलाह ले लें और मेरा अमेंडमेंट नम्बर ४८९ मंजूर कर लें । इस से बहुत सी तकालीफ दूर हो जायेंगी ।

Shri Nesamony (Nagercoil): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have tabled my amendment No. 419 to clause 125 of the Bill, which says:

> Page 57, line 4—
>
> omit "for a period of six months from that day."

That clause deals with pleaders practising in the subordinate courts of a transferred territory. As the clause is now worded, these pleaders can practise in the courts of the transferred territories for six months. After six months what they are to do is not evident from that clause or from any other provision in this Bill. Sir, I will read the clause. It says:

> "Any person who immediately before the appointed day, is enrolled as a pleader entitled to practise in any subordinate courts in an existing State which is affected by the provisions of Part II shall, for a period of six months from that day, continue to be entitled to practise in those courts, notwithstanding that the whole or any part of the territories within the jurisdiction of those courts has been transferred to another State."

I will take a concrete illustration. The territorial jurisdiction of seven Munisiff's courts and seven Magistrate's courts which are subordinate to the District Court of Nagercoil, which is presided over by a District Judge, two Additional District Judges and a Sub-Judge, are transferred to Madras. Pleaders were practising—they were not advocates—in these subordinate courts in that area. Now, for six months they can practise in the courts which have been transferred to the Madras State. After six months what are they to do? Are they to discontinue their practice? That is why I have moved that amendment to delete the phrase "for a period of six months from that day". If that portion is deleted and if you, Sir, will be

[Shri Nesamony]

pleased to read that clause again, that difficulty will be removed. Then the clause will read:

> "Any person who immediately before the appointed day, is enrolled as a pleader entitled to practise in any subordinate courts in an existing State which is affected by the provisions of Part II shall continue to be entitled to practise in those courts, notwithstanding that the whole or any part of the territories within the jurisdiction of those courts has been transferred to another State."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Meanwhile he shall have opportunity to choose where he wants to practise.

Shri Nesamony: There is no provision; that is what I say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will have that option. He can apply to be enrolled there.

Shri Nesamony: What I submit is, there is no provision so far as pleaders who practise in subordinate courts are concerned. There is option given to advocates in certain cases in the new States. In the States of Hyderabad and advocates of other States that option is given, but in the case of pleaders, who are not advocates, that option is not given anywhere in this Bill. That lacuna is a thing that has to be very seriously considered. It affects a lot of pleaders who are practising in the subordinate courts which are transferred to another State. Especially, in Travancore-Cochin it affects a good lot of people. I request the Home Minister to consider this matter very seriously and to accept my amendment which is meant to obviate these difficulties. The pleaders are allowed to practise now only in the subordinate courts. There *sanads* are only for practising in the subordinate courts. They must be allowed to continue to enjoy the existing privileges and rights which they have been enjoying in the past, and their practice should not be limited to a period of six months. They must be allowed to have their existing rights to practise irrespective of a transfer of territory to another State. I request the Home Minister to consider this matter seriously and accept my amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The following amendments to clauses 115 to 131 of the Bill have been indicated by the Members to be moved subject to their being otherwise admissible:

Clause No.	No. of amendments.
116	518
125	419
129	489
131	492
132 (New)	257

Clause 116.— (*Provisions relating to other services.*)

Shri V. P. Nayar: I beg to move:

Page 54—

after line 14, add:

> "Provided that when the new State is formed all persons in the service of Government and also in quasi Governmental institutions and local boards, shall have the minimum pay and allowances equal to the highest of the minimum pay and allowances for that class of officials in the areas which comprise the new State".

Clause 125.— (*Right of pleaders to practise in certain courts*)

Shri Nesamony: I beg to move:

Page 57, line 4—

omit "for a period of six months from that day".

Clause 129.— (*Power to remove difficulties*)

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: I beg to move:

Page 58—

after line 20, *add*:

> "(2) The President may by order do appoint an ex-judge

or judges to settle the boundary disputes referred to him by States concerned within a year after the appointed day."

Clause 131—(*Repeal of Act 49 of 1951*)

Dr. Rama Rao: I beg to move:

Page 58—

after line 34, add:

> "(3) Notwithstanding the repeal of the Government of Part C States Act, 1951, it shall be lawful for the President to make an order applying to any Union Territory all or any of the provisions of that Act with such adaptations and modifications as may be specified in the order.
>
> (4) The order referred to in sub-section (3) shall remain in force until the law referred to in clause (1) of article 240 is made by Parliament and shall be deemed to be the law made under that article."

New Clause 132

Shri Gadilingana Gowd (Kurnool): I beg to move:

Page 58—

after line 34, add:

> "132. The Central Government shall within three months after the formation of the new States appoint Boundary Commission to demarcate boundaries of and settle the dispute of claims and counter claims of border areas of all new States and particularly to settle border disputes of Madras, Andhra and Karnataka."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These amendments are before the House.

Shri A. M. Thomas: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir I wish to make certain observations about Part X of the Bill which deals with provisions regarding the services. My object in intervening at this stage is mainly to impress on this House as well as on the Home Ministry the necessity of giving top priority to division and integration of services among the States affected by reorganisation. This matter has been dealt with by the States Reorganisation Commission in Chapter 2, Part IV of their report. It has certain significant observations to offer which may be borne in mind by the Central Government. It is stated that in a matter like the services, the policy of drift or what amounts virtually to that, is very unsatisfactory and to keep up the morale of the services and their efficiency, it would be absolutely necessary that the services are not kept in any suspense or uncertainty. The Commission has stated as follows in one portion of its report:

> "Whatever the reasons, the uncertainty which prevailed in the initial years after the formation of Part B and Part C States has been such as to affect the morale of the services and to impair efficiency".

I wish to state that this experience should not be allowed to be repeated.

It has been stated on the floor of this House by several Members including my friend Shri V. P. Nayar that because of the delay and the drift in the matter of settlement of disputes with regard to inter se seniority, etc., there has been a great deal of discontent among the services. Although seven or eight years have passed since the States were integrated, several questions have not been decided especially with regard to categorisation on the integration of services. Not only with regard to the Government servants who have been taken over to the Central services but even with regard to the Government servants who were retained in the States service, several problems have not yet been decided. Because of this, it has led to a great deal of agitation. Different associations and organisations have been formed within one State itself and in one department itself for the services coming from the different territories in one and the same State. It has been our bitter experience that although

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

only two States were integrated as far as my part of the country is concerned, even now, several problems relating to the services that were integrated still remain unsettled. There is an organisation of the Cochin Government servants; there is an organisation of the Travancore Government servants. Still, these organisations are holding annual conferences, passing resolutions, and accusing one another saying that one section has been treated badly or unfairly. My submission is that we should never allow this state of affairs to continue in the matter of integration of the services which would become necessary on the present reorganisation of States.

With regard to Shri Gopalan's amendment, I may make one observation. You will notice that the following has been provided in Part X of the Bill:

> "Provided that the conditions of service applicable inunediately before the appointed day to the case of any person referred to In sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) shall not be varied to his disadvantage except with the previous approval of the Central Government".

So, we can rest assured that the existing conditions of service may not be changed to the disadvantage of the Government servants concerned.

Shri Gopalan's amendment goes a step further and wants a provision to be incorporated in this Bill which would enable the granting of the highest minimum in the highest scale of pay that obtains in the particular State concerned, for the particular class of service. I am glad that my friend Shri V. P. Nayar referred to the various scales of pay in different States and he has been fair enough to admit that as far as the services in the lower scales are concerned, Travancore-Cochin stands far in advance when compared to the States of Mysore and Madras.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I should not be misinterpreted. I gave one or two instances where the scales of pay in Travancore-Cochin were better than in the neighbouring States. If the House could listen patiently, I can give about 15 more instances to show that the scales of pay there are much less.

Shri A. M. Thomas: When the Travancore-Cochin budget was discussed on the floor of this House, my friend was not prepared to agree to what I said, and the Home Minister had to quote facts and figures to show that the scales of pay in Travancore-Cochin, at least in the lower categories, were much better than those in Mysore or Madras. The hon. Member was not then prepared even to concede that point. Today, I am glad to know that my friend has himself come forward with figures to justify the statement made by the hon. Minister on the former occasion.

Apart from merits of this amendment, I must say this, namely, that no State can afford to have different scales of pay for officers doing the very same work. If a police inspector who bas come from the Madras Government service to the Kerala Government service, he cannot be paid a scale of pay which is lower than what the police inspector in Kerala is drawing. Though technically it may not be a discrimination since he was drawing only a lower salary before his transfer to Kerala, yet, it would be inexpedient and improper that different scales of pay are retained or perpetuated. But, however if provisions are to be made for such contingencies, we will have to introduce several other provisions also. I do not think any statutory provision is necessary and it may not be quite proper to have any such provision in the Bill itself. Provision has been made for the constitution of advisory committees in the

Bill. If you turn to clause 116, sub-clause (5), you will find the following provision:

> "The Central Government may by order establish one or more Advisory Committees for the purpose of assisting it in regard to—
>
> (a) the division and integration of the services among the new States and the States of Andhra Pradesh and Madras; and
>
> (b) the ensuring of fair and equitable treatment to all persons affected by the provisions of this section and for proper consideration of any representations made by such persons."

My submission is that the States would necessarily have to take into consideration all these facts. Advisory committees will also be constituted and their advice will certainly be on the lines that have been suggested by my friends.

Before I close, I want to make some observations touching certain reports appearing in the Press with regard to the allocation of government servants from the Madras service to the Kerala service. I am glad my friend, Mr. Venkataraman, is present here. He yields considerable influence not only in the Central Government, but also in the Madras Government. It has been reported that according to tentative conclusions which have been reached at the State level, the division would be made on a population basis. The Government servants that would be transferred to the future Kerala State from Madras would be based on the population of the Madras district minus the population of the four taluks of South Travancore. If that is done, it would lead to considerable hardship and unfairness, as I will indicate presently. In clause 117, it has been provided as follows:

> "Every person who immediately before the appointed day is holding or discharging the duties of any post or office in connection with the affairs of Union or of an existing State in any area which on that day falls within another existing State or a new Part A State or a Part C State shall, except where by virtue or in consequence of the provisions of this Act such post or office ceases to exist on that day continue to hold the some post . . . ." etc.

With regard to that, I have absolutely no quarrel. All those Government servants who are at present posted in the district of Malabar would necessarily have to go to the Kerala service. *But*, it would be unfair to go further and say that the allocation should be on the basis of population. I think some conclusions have been reached between the T. C. Government and the Madras Government in this matter. Even in Part X, it has been said as follows:

> "Every person who immediately before the appointed day is serving in connection with the affairs of an existing State part of whose territories is transferred to another State by the provisions of Part II shall, as from that day, provisionally continue to serve in connection with the affairs of the principal successor State. . . . ."

My submission to this House and through this House to the Home Ministry and the Government of Madras is this. Provisionally all those government servants have to continue in the successor State, namely, Madras. Until the necessary categorisation and division of services take place, before that it would be unfair to make any allocation of the Government servants working in Madras to the Kerala State. It will be specially unfair to the Kerala State, because, as you all know, there is no popular Ministry functioning in that State. There is President's rule and it is the Adviser who has to tackle these problems. In order to inspire confidence among the people of the Kerala State, it is absolutely necessary that decisions with regard to these matters should only be taken after a popular Ministry comes into existence in that State. If anything

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

is allowed to be done before that by the Home Ministry based on the recommendation of the present T. C. Government, it will not be proper. I do not know myself whether such decisions have been taken; I mainly base my arguments on newspaper reports and on the fears expressed by a section of the Government servants. If that is true, it will lead to considerable discontent and it will also lower the morale of the servinces in the Kerala State . (*Interruptions*). . .When I am speaking on a serious matter, my friend is referring to Advisor's regime, Congress regime etc. It is absolutely necessary that as soon as possible after the appointed day, these questions should be decided. But one regard is to be shown to the peculiar circumstances in which the Kerala State is placed. In the matter of categorisation of services, special consideration would have to be shown and no decision should be taken which may later on be challenged as not being in the interests of the State or in the interest of the services concerned.

श्री बी० ये० रेड्डी (करीमनगर): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं श्री वे० प० नायर के अमेंडमेंट संशोधन नं० ५१८ की ताईद करता हूं क्योंकि वह मेरे सूबे के लिये भी ठीक तौर से ऐपलाई होता है। जिस तरह से ट्रावनकोर के मामले में यह मसला पेश है उसी तरह से हमारे यहां भी यह मसला पेश हो रहा है क्योंकि हैदराबाद की सर्विसेज की कई केटेगरीज (श्रेणियों) की तन्ख्वाहें आंध्र की उन्हीं केटेगरीज की तनन्ख्वाहों से ज्यादा हैं। इस चीज को लेकर वहां पर एक खास किस्म की तश्वीश पैदा हो गई है। यह सोचते हैं कि आंध्र प्रदेश के एग्जिस्टेंस (निर्माण) में आने के बाद उन का क्या हाल होगा। आया हैदराबाद की उनकी तन्ख्वाहें बरकरार रक्खी जायेंगी या कि आंध्र स्टेट की तन्ख्वाहें हैं उनके मुताबिक उन लोगों की तनख्वाहों को कम कर दिया जायेगा। इस परेशानी को दूर करने के लिये इस बिल के अन्दर कोई चीज नहीं है। जो भी प्राविजन (उपबंध) इस बिल (विधेयक) के अन्दर हैं उनसे किसी खास किस्म की गारेन्टी नहीं मिलती है और उनकी तश्वीश बाकी रह जाती है। इसलिये जैसा अमेंडमेंट में बताया गया है उस तरह का कोई प्राविजन उनकी परेशानी को दूर करने के लिये रखना जरूरी है। अगर हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब इस अमेंडमेंट को मान कर उसको बिल में शरीक कर लें तो बहुत ही अच्छा होगा क्योंकि जो भी तश्वीश वहां पर पैदा हो गई है वह उससे दूर हो जायेगी और उनकी एक गारंन्टी (प्रत्याभूति) सी मिल जायेगी। उनके अन्दर जो एक अनसर्टेन्टी पैदा हो गई है यह दूर हो जायेगी। इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि इस अमेंडमेंट को जरूर मंजूर कर लिया जाये।

इसके बाद जो अमेंडमेंट श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी जी का है उसकी भी मैं ताईद करता हूं। यह अमेंडमेंट बार्डर के झगड़ों के मुताल्लिक है। यह अमेंडमेंट बहुत जरूरी है। इससे पहले बाउंड्री कमीशन (सीमा आयोग) के बारे में जितने अमेंडमेंट्स थे वह पेश हो चुके हैं और उन पर डिस्कशन (चर्चा) भी हो चुका है। मैं यह भी मानता हूं कि यह स्टेज अब बाउंड्री कमीशन के बारे में चर्चा करने की नहीं है, लेकिन फिर भी जिस क्लाज के जरिये से प्रेजिडेंट (राष्ट्रपति) को अख्त्यारात दिये जा रहे हैं, उसकी तहत इस बारे में भी प्राविजन यहां पर रक्खे जा सकते हैं। इसके लिये अगर हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब स्पेसिफिकली (स्पष्टत:) मेन्शन (उल्लेख) कर दें तो बहुत अच्छा होगा। बार्डर की जो प्राब्लम (समस्या) है वह एक बहुत मुश्किल मामला है और किसी ने यह नहीं बताया है कि उसको हल करने

का क्या रास्ता है । होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी इस पर कोई रोशनी नहीं डाली है, न कोई हल ही बताया है, उनका इतना ही कहना था कि अगर तुम लोग आपस में मिल कर किसी खास नतीजे पर पहुंच जाओगे और कोई समझौता कर लोगे तो हमें उसके मानने में कोई ऐतराज नहीं होगा । उन्होंने इसके सिवा कोई रास्ता नहीं बताया है। अगर कोई दूसरा रास्ता बताया है तो सिर्फ यह की जो जोनल काउंसिल्स (प्रादेशिक परिषदें) होंगी उनमें इन झगड़ों को रखा जाएगा। मैं समझता हूं कि इन जोनल काउंसिल्स में इन झगड़ों का निपटारा नहीं हो सकेगा । वहां पर इन मसलों पर चर्चा होगी लेकिन किसी फैसले पर नहीं पहुंचा जा सकेगा। उनके फैसलों को जब स्टेटस (राज्यों) के रिप्रिजेंटेटिव (प्रतिनिधि) नहीं मानेंगे तो इनको ड्राप (अस्वीकार) कर दिया जाएगा । आपने इसके बारे में कुछ भी नहीं कहा है कि मैजोरिटी वोट (बहु संख्यक मत) के जरिये से इनको तय किया जाएंगा या किसी और तरह से । आपने इसमें जो वर्डिंग रखे हैं वह हैं "मे रिकोमेंड"। लेकिन और एक बात जो हो सकती है वह यह कि वे रिकोमेंड भी न करें। इसमें स्टेटस (राज्य) के जो रिप्रिजेंटेटिव (प्रतिनिधि) होंगे वे कभी भी एग्री नहीं करेंगे और न ही इन काउंसिल्स की रिकोमेंडेशंस (सिफारिशों) को मानेंगे। जोनल काउंसिल्स क्या क्या कर सकेंगी तथा उनके क्या क्या अख्तियार होंगे, इसको भी साफ नहीं किया गया है। इस वास्ते इन डिसप्यूटस को सेटल (निबटारा) करने के लिए आपने जोनल काउंसिल्स को कोई पावर्स नहीं दी हैं। वे इस वास्ते कोई इफेक्टिव बाडीज (प्रभावी निकाय) नहीं होंगी और वे मसलों को हल नहीं कर पायेंगी। इस वास्ते मैं चाहता हूं कि बाउंडरी कमिशन की एप्वाइंटमेंट (नियुक्ति) के बारे में इसमें कोई न कोई प्राविजन होना चाहिये। अगर आपने बाउंडरी कमिशंस बैठाने के बारे में कोई प्राविजन (उपबंध) न रखा तो मैं समझता झगड़े वैसे के वैसे ही कायम रहेंगे और स्टेटस के दरम्यान झगड़े चलते रहेंगे। इसका जो नेचुरल नतीजा होगा वह यह कि पीस कायम नहीं रह सकेगा । इस वास्ते मैं प्रार्थना करता हूं कि इस तरह का कोई न कोई प्राविजन इसमें अवश्य होना चाहिये। मैं चाहता हूं कि इस पर गवर्नमेंट गौर करे और कोई न कोई फैसला करे। अगर वह इस बात को नहीं मानती है तो जो एमेंडमेंट दिया गया है उसको तो इसे अवश्य ही मान लेना चाहिये । आज बहुत से बोर्डर डिसप्यूटस चल रहे हैं । एक तरफ से—तेलंगाना से—तो २०० विल्लेज कर्नाटक में जा रहे हैं लेकिन दूसर तरफ उधर से जो विल्लेज इस तरफ आते हैं उनके बारे में कोई प्राविजन नहीं रखा गया है। हमें कहा गया कि हम आपस में बैठकर कोई समझौता कर लें। दो तीन दिन हुए कि महाराष्ट्र, कर्नाटक और आंध्र के मैम्बर्स आफ पार्लियामेंट की एक मीटिंग हुई थी और वहां पर फैसला करने की कोशिश भी की गई लेकिन किसी नतीजे पर नहीं पहुंचा जा सका। महाराष्ट्र और आंध्र के बीच बोर्डर डिसप्यूटस हैं। दूसरी तरफ जब हैदराबाद असेम्बली में स्टेट्स रिआर्गेनाइजेशन बिल पर बहस हुई तो वहां पर कुछ एमेंडमेंटस पास किए गए थे । एक समझौता हैदराबाद असेम्बली में यह हुआ था कि अदिलाबाद के तालूके राजुरा और किनवट को महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया जाय और नादेंड जिले के पांच रेविन्यू सर्कल्स और सिरवंचा तालूका को जो मध्य प्रदेश में है आंध्र प्रादेश में शामिल कर दिया जाये सेलेक्ट कमिटी

[श्री ब० पे० रेड्डी]

(प्रवर समिति) ने राजूरा और किनवट तलूको तो महाराष्ट्र में शामिल कर दिया है लेकिन सिरवंचा तालूके को आंध्र प्रदेश में शामिल करने को नहीं स्वीकार किया है। और उसके बारे में इस बिल में कोई जिक्र नहीं किया गया है। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूं कि यह जो सिरबंचा ताल्लुका है इसमें प्रिडोमिनेंटली (अधिकतः) तेलगू बोलने वाले लोग रहते हैं। इसकी ६४,००० की आबादी है जिसमें से ४८,००० तेलगू स्पीकिंग हैं और केवल ८,००० ही ऐसे लोग हैं जो कि महाराष्ट्री स्पीकिंग (भाषा-भाषी) हैं। यह इकोनोमिकली (आर्थिक दृष्टि से) तथा कलचरली (सांस्कृतिक दृष्टि से) आंध्र को जाना चाहिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप तफसील में न जायें और जिन क्लाजिज (खण्डों) पर बहस हो रही हैं उन्हीं के बारे में बोलें।

श्री ब० पे० रेड्डी : मैं आपको जो मुश्किलात हैं, ये बतला रहा था। जो उन असेम्बलीस (विधान सभाओं) में पास हुआ है उनके बारे में मैं आपको कुछ बतला रहा था। ये जो एग्रीमेंटस (करार) हुए हैं उनके कुछ हिस्से तो मान लिए गए हैं लेकिन दूसरे हिस्से नहीं माने गए हैं। मैं नहीं समझ पाया हूं कि उन हिस्सों को क्यों ड्राप कर दिया गया है। इनको ड्राप करने का क्या कारण है, मैं गवर्नमेंट से इस बारे में पूछना चाहता हूं। अगर इस तरह से आपने किया तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि ये जो झगड़े हैं, ये कैसे तय होंगे। महाराष्ट्र, कर्नाटक और आंध्र में कितने ही झगड़े अभी तय होने को बाकी हैं। आपने हम से कहा कि हम मिल बैठकर इनको तय कर लें लेकिन वहां पर भी कोई फैसला नहीं हो सका। अब आप ही बताइये कि इनको कैसे हल किया जाए? जोनल काउंसिल्स (प्रादेशिक परिषद्) में भी मैं जानता हूं, इन्हें हल नहीं किया जा सकेगा। इस वास्ते मैं प्रार्थना करता हूं कि इस बिल में इन झगड़ों को तय करने के लिए कोई न कोई स्पेसिफक प्राविजन (निश्चित उपबंध) होनी चाहिये। अगर आप अपने आप कोई हल नहीं बतलाते हैं और कोई स्पेसिफिक प्राविजन इस बिल में नहीं रखते हैं तो मैं प्रार्थना करता हूं कि जो एमेंडमेंट मूव की गई है, श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी की तरफ से, उसको आप एक्सपेक्ट कर लें।

अब मैं माइनोरिटीज (अल्प संख्यकों) के बारे में थोड़ा सा अर्ज करना चाहता हूं। अब जो बोर्डर एरियाज (सीमा क्षेत्र) होंगे वे बाईलिंगुअल एरियाज (द्विभाषी क्षेत्र) होंगे। कुछ एरियाज तो किसी तरफ आ रहे हैं और कुछ किसी तरफ। लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी कुछ बोर्डर एरियाज ऐसे रह जायेंगे, जो कि बाइलिंगुअल होंगे और उनमें जो माइनोरिटीज (अल्प संख्यक) होंगी, उनके लिए कुछ सेफगार्डस (संरक्षण) आपको देने होंगे। ये जो लिंग्विस्टिक माइनोरिटीज है हैदराबाद है ये वहां पर बहुत देर से हैं। ये हिन्दुस्तानी बोलते हैं और उर्दू भी बोलते हैं। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि इन के हकूक की रक्षा करने के लिए क्या किया है। इसका भी कोई उपाय ढूंढना चाहिये था और इसके बारे में भी कोई प्राविजन इस बिल में रखना चाहिये था। मैंने सुना है कि होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह कहा है कि इसके बारे में कोई एमेंडमेंट इस बिल में नहीं लाया जाना चाहिये और उसे जो कांस्टीट्यूशन एमेंडमेंट बिल (संविधान संशोधन विधेयक) है उसमें लाया जाना चाहिये। इसके अलावा उन्होंने एक दूसरा

तरीका अख्तियार करने को भी बात कही है। उनका कहना हैं कि यह किसी रेज़ोल्यूशन (संकल्प) के जरिये या किसी स्टेटमेंट (वक्तव्य) के जरिये या किसी सर्क्यूलर (परिपत्र) के जरिये हो सकता ह मै समझता हूं कि ये जो सर्क्यूलर होते हैं इसको कोई स्टेचुटरी (संविहित) हैसियत नहीं होती है। सर्क्युलर पर अम्ल भी हो सकता है और अगर कोई उन पर अम्ल न भी करना चाहे तो वह उन पर अम्ल नहीं भी कर सकता है। मै नहीं समझता कि किसी रेज़ोल्यूशन के जरिये या किसी स्टेटमेंट के जरिये यह चीज हल हो सकती है। अगर आप समझते हैं कि इस तरह से यह चीज हल हो सकती है तो मैं कहता हूं आप गलती पर हैं। इससे लोगों की इत्मिनान नहीं हो सकता है और उनकी परेशानी बढ़ सकती है। यह इस मसले का कोई हल नहीं है। हैदराबाद के लोगों ने इसके बारे में कई रिप्रिजन्टेशंस (अभ्यावेदन) सेंट्र को तथा स्टेट गवर्नमेंट को भेजी हैं। लेकिन उनके बारे में कुछ नहीं हुआ है और कोई एक्शन नहीं लिया गया है।

Shri Kamath: On a point of order. There is no quorum in the House.

Shri V. P. Nayar: For the third time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The bell is being rung.—Now there is quorum. The hon. Member may continue.

Shri Kamath: The Prime Minister has an opportunity to see that there is no quorum in spite of his instructions to his party.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now there is quorum. He can proceed.

श्री ब० पे० रेड्डी : तो मैं हैदराबाद को माइनोरिटीज के बारे में अर्ज कर रहा था। उनके राइटस को सेफगार्ड करने के लिए इस बिल में कोई प्राविजन नहीं है और मैं चाहता हूं कि इसके लि स्टेचुटरी (संविहित उपबंध) होगा चाहिये, कोई स्टेचटेरी सैंकशन होनी चाहिये। अगर आप ऐसा नहीं करते हैं तो इसका कोई मतलब नहीं रहता है। आप उनके हकूक को तथा उनके इंटरेस्टस (हितों) को किसी सर्क्युलर के जरिये से सेफगार्ड नहीं कर सकते हैं। वह नहीं हो सकता है। यह नामुमकिन है। लिहाजा कुछ न कुछ प्राविजन इस किस्म का जरूर करना चाहिए। अगर इस बिल में कोई नई क्लाज ऐड की जा सके, तो कर दी जाये या फिर कांस्टीच्यूशन (संविधान) में कोई अमेंडमेंट (संशोधन) कर दी जाये।

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): I came only to learn and not to speak.

Shri V. P. Nayar: And there was no quorum.

Shri Venkataraman: But my friend Shri A. M. Thomas has referred to a matter which at best could have been the subject-matter of a reference or a letter or a representation to the Home Ministry. He has utilised the forum of this House for ventilating apparently a complaint by a small section of the staff of the Madras Government. But I might explain te you the real situation.

The Madras Government employ a large number of Malayalees--I am saying this only to indicate their mother-tongue, not that I want to make any distinctions—in fact, a number larger than in proportion to their population or numbers. Naturally, when the linguistic States were formed, the officers became nervous, and they wanted to know from the Madras Government whether their service conditions would be properly protected or not. Therefore, the Government of Madras in their anxiety to allay the possible fears on the part of the employees who were Malayalees stated that their conditions of service and their employment would be safe, and that the allocation at best would be made only on the basis of the population of the particular district from which they come, that is to say, even if a larger percentage of the Malayalees are employed as civil servants or employees in the Madras State, the number of persons

[Shri Venkataraman]

to be transferred to the new Kerala State will not be more than what their population and numbers would warrant. The Madras Government are willing and are prepared to carry on their register a much larger number of employees who come from Malabar. Therefore, instead of being unfair, the Madras Government have been more than fair to the people from Malabar, in so far as they have agreed that they will carry on their register a larger percentage of persons from Malabar.

Then, I come to the question of allocation. The allocation of personnel is made by a committee consisting only of officials. The Madras Government officials are represented in that Committee, and the Travancore-Cochin Government officials are also represented in that committee. So, actually, it is being done at an inter-departmental level, between officers of more or less equal rank. Any suggestion of unfairness on the ground that in one State there is a Ministry and in the other, there is no Ministry, and therefore the rights are likely to be affected, seems to be unfounded, because the Madras Government officials are as good as the Travancore-Cochin Government officials. If anything, the Travancore-Cochin Government officials have a reputation for being much cleverer than the poor Madras Government officials.

Shri A. M. Thomas: You do not accept the compliment?

Shri Venkataraman: My only object in intervening in this debate is to make it clear that there has not been the slightest trace of unfairness. On the contrary, it is the Madras Government who have gone out of their way to allay the suspicions and fears which were created in the minds of the Malayalee members of the Madras services that as a result of the reorganisation of States, they might also be sent away to the new State.

There is one other matter which I would like the Minister to consider, and that relates to clause 125, to which my hon. friend Shri Nesamony has made a reference. The position of legal practitioners is different from that of advocates. Advocates are entitled to enrol in every High Court as a matter of right. Legal practitioners are entitled to practise only in that particular area in which they are enrolled and have taken the *sanad*. If we do not have a clause like 125 in the Bill, then on the appointed day, all those practising in the Tamil areas of Travancore-Cochin would cease to be entitled to practise because that area has been transferred to the Madras State. So this gives them a period of six months within which they can enrol themselves or can take the *sanad* as pleaders under the Madras High Court.

Previously, when Andhra was separated, pleaders entitled to practise in that area were allowed to enrol themselves as pleaders under the Andhra High Court. The only possible difficulty that may arise to practitioners in the Tamil area that is proposed to be transferred, would be that the qualifications prescribed by the one High Court may be different from the qualifications prescribed by the other High Court. If there is any difference in the qualifications prescribed for enrolment as pleaders in different High Courts, it is up to the Home Ministry to remove the difficulty. It is only in that connection that I am anxious that the Home Ministry should look carefully into this. For instance, in Madras in order that a pleader may be entitled to practise, he will have to pass the pleadership examination or take a law degree without taking one-year apprenticeship or passing an examination in practice and procedure. In Travancore-Cochin, I do not know what the practice today is. If the qualifications required in Travancore-Cochin are lower than those required for the Madras enrolment as pleaders, then notwithstanding that their qualifications are lower, the Government of India will have to issue such directions as may be necessary to see that those who were on the rolls practising in the Tamil area of Travancore-Cochin, are eligible to be enrolled as pleaders in Madras.

This situation is likely to arise not only in the case of Travancore-Cochin but also with reference to the transferred territory of South Kanara and also the transferred territory of Malabar. So far as Malabar is concerned, the qualifications prescribed by Madras are pretty high and, therefore, they would ordinarily be eligible to be enrolled as pleaders in the State to which they are transferred. But if the qualifications are different, and are lower, in any transferred territory, that should not stand in the way of their being enrolled as pleaders. This is an administrative matter and no amendment to the law is necessary. I would like the Home Minister to bear this in mind.

Shri C. R. Iyyunni: With regard to integration of services, I wish to say a few words. This is a matter which has brought a lot of difficulty to people residing in the Cochin State. After this Bill is passed into law, there is no doubt that the integration of services will be a question which will tax the intelligence of the Central Government in the Home Ministry. In almost every State, this difficulty will crop up. There will be a few officers in one particular State which has been merged into some other State. The cadre will be different, the service conditions will be different, the kind of work may be different

In Travancore-Cochin, the difficulty arose in this way. In certain departments, for confirmation, the beginning of service, the date on which he entered service, was taken into consideration. From that date onwards, the number of years he had put in counted for his claim for seniority. In certain other departments, some other principle was followed.

In certain cases, the difficulty arose because of the name of the office. Sometimes, it so happens that he may be doing a different work. Take the case of foresters. A forester may be doing some other work in some other department. Therefore, a lot of complications arose Even now, the integration of services is not completed. Both the Travancore people and the Cochin people are dissatisfied. The reason is that in the integration of one department, certain principles are followed, while in the integration of some other department, certain other principles are adopted. The result is that nobody is able to understand how the integration will take place.

So unless there is a definite set of principles evolved as to how intergration should be effected, it will be always difficult to achieve integration. From the little experience that we have, what we would say is that before anything is done certain definite principles must be adopted so that there may not be any trouble with regard to the integration of services. Even then there may be some difficulty. As a matter of fact, when there are two or three cadres, there is bound to be some difficulty in bringing uniformity in all these two or three cadres. Some would be harshly affected, some would be prejudicially affected and some will have an advantage also. It is a matter which taxes the intelligence of the department very much. Therefore, what I wish to suggest is that a Committee or Commission will have to be appointed to draft the rules and regulations or the principles under which integration ought to be effected If that is not done, it is going to be a very troublesome affair.

Now, we have been trying to formulate a few rules. Even then they are not sufficiently satisfactory. So, a body of people who are very much experienced in the line of administration and in controlling promotions etc., should consider the question very carefully and adumbrate or formulate a few principles Unless it is done it will be very difficult. That is all I have to say with regard to this matter.

[Shri C. R. Iyyunni]

Secondly, a matter has been brought to the notice of the House by Shri Thomas. The area that we get and the population—those things—should not be made a ground for government servants in the Madras State to be allocated to the new Kerala State that is going to be formed. As a matter of fact, one principle should be adopted and that is the number of officers or government servants who are now occupying posts say in Malabar and other areas to be transferred should be taken as the principle. If it is going to be taken, probably, we may not be very seriously affected. Otherwise, the Kerala State would certainly be prejudicially affected.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There appears to be no desire on the part of any hon. Member to speak. So, shall I call the hon. Minister?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, I want to speak. Yesterday also, Sir....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yesterday also the hon. Member did the same thing!

Shri U. M. Trivedi: About these legal and miscellaneous provisions that are provided in clause 120, it appears to me that we have forgotten the provisions of article 14 of our Constitution.

Articles 13 and 14 are very important provisions of our constitutional law which do not allow any discrimination between subjects of the same State. Although the law is there, the discrimination will continue. Supposing a particular type of tenancy law is in existence in Madhya Bharat and another type of tenancy law is prevailing in Madhya Pradesh, when they join together as one State, one area will be governed by the Madhya Bharat law and the other will be governed by the other law. It has been held by the Supreme Court in the appeal case of State *vs*. Rai Manohar Sinha of Bedla that such discrimination on merely geographical grounds is not allowed in law.

Shri A. M. Thomas: It is only a transitional provision.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: But this will also create difficulties.

Clause 120 says:

> The provisions of Part II shall not be deemed to have effected any change in the territories to which any law in force immediately before the appointed day extends or applies, and territorial references in any such law to an existing State shall, until otherwise provided by a competent Legislature or other competent authority be construed as meaning the territories within that State immediately before the appointed day.

Unless and until you are going to change that law unless some finality is reached and some amendment to such a law is made, these two laws will simultaneously continue to work In the new State. In other words, we will be giving an opportunity for discrimination and we will let loose the flood of litigation between the parties. One or the other may be declared void by virtue of this provision itself. My suggestion is that a provision must be made somewhat of this nature that the President may be authorised to issue on the appointed day a list of laws which he will adapt to the new State. Just as we did when the Adaptation of Laws Order was passed and applied on and from the 26th January 1950, when a new State is formed, a similar provision must be made that on and from the appointed day, the President may be authorised to issue a notification applying particular laws with certain modifications or adaptions, if necessary, to the new State which is to be formed. That will stop this anomaly which is going to arise by virtue of the provisions in clause 120.

I will draw the attention of this House to the provisions In clause 125 which says:

> Any person who immediately before the appointed day is enrolled as a pleader entitled to practise in any subordinate courts in an existing State which is affected by the provisions of Part II shall, for a period of six months from that day continue to be entitled to practise in those courts notwithstanding that the whole or any part of the territories within the judisdiction of those courts has been transferred to another State.

What is this? We have got this provision in our Constitution that no one under the provisions of article 19 will be debarred from practising any trade or profession or occupation. Simply because a territorial change has taken place, the particular occupation of the man concerned or a lawyer concerned is checked by making this provision that he will be allowed to parctise only for six months. What is he going to do after six months if his practice is established there and he is eking his livelihood there? Why is he deprived of continuing his practice there?

Shri Venkataraman: He should enrol himself as a pleader.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: This moot point was put and my friend, Shri Venkataraman was not here then and he could not come to the rescue of the hon. Home Minister, but he has only arrived today. The question was put to the hon. Home Minister that no difficulties should be created in the way of advocates or pleaders of the various High Courts when this particular thing takes place and that a suitable provision must be made here. The hon. Home Minister was pleased to say that he will look into the matter and see that no such difficulties are created in the way of these people. He will practise only for six months and not more. How can be make a change, all of a sudden? He should be allowed to practise. Under section 5 of the Legal Practitioners Act the pleader or advocate of one place is allowed to practise in any of the subordinate courts of any other place except probably in the great and important State of Bombay where difficulties are created for advocates. In all the other States, a man can go and practise in the subordinate courts, if he is an advocate of a High Court.

6 P.M.

Shri Nambiar: The hon. Member can speak tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I may have to call the Minister tomorrow. He may finish now.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I was going to speak on clause 127. I was going to speak first but I was called in and so I had to go.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These arguments, some of them, may have already been advanced by the other hon. Members and the hon. Member may not know them.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I will have to speak on clause 127.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may continue tomorrow. The River Boards Bill and the Inter-State Water Disputes Bill may be taken up tomorrow.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 8th August, 1956.

MINUTES OF ESTIMATES COMMITTE . . . 2375

Shri B. G. Mehta presented the Minutes of the Estimates Committee (1955-56) Vol. 5, Nos. 4 and 5. 3

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE . . 2375-76

Time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill was extended upto 10th August, 1956. 3

BILL INTRODUCED . . 2376

National Highways Bill was introduced. 4

BILL UNDER CONSIDERATION 2376-2530

Further discussion on the clauses of the States Reorganisation Bill, as reported by the Joint Committee, was continued. The Minister of Home Affairs replied to the discussion on clauses 2 to 15 of the Bill. 5—209

The discussion on clauses 71 to 114 and the Schedules IV to VI was concluded and the Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs replied to the discussion.

Voting on the clauses and Schedules was postponed with the consent of the House.

Consideration of clauses 115 to 131 was taken up and not concluded.

AGENDA FOR WEDNESDAY, 8th AUGUST, 1956--

Statement by the Prime Minister re. Suez Canal issue.